Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-208
Friday
26 October 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-208 26 October 1990

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An • indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Progress at Vienna CFE Talks Viewed 1
Changes in World Military Situation Hailed *[Moscow Radio]* 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

New European Alliance Plans Termed 'Ill-Timed' *[TASS]* 3
UN Envoy Addresses Coordination Committee *[TASS]* 3

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Cheney Interviewed During Moscow Visit *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Oct]* 4
U.S. Has Mixed Feelings About Trade With USSR *[IZVESTIYA 13 Oct]* 5

Near East & South Asia

Reports Continue on Primakov's Middle East Tour 6
Meets With Syria's Al-Asad *[TASS]* 6
Relays Message From Gorbachev *[Moscow Radio]* 6
Returns to Cairo 26 Oct *[TASS]* 6
Mideast Coverage Noted *[cross-reference]* 6
Toughening Sanctions Against Iraq Favored *[Moscow International]* 6
Peace Committee Delegates Meet Kuwaiti Envoy *[TASS]* 7
Open Letter to Gorbachev on Gulf Published *[SOVETSKAYA PATRIOT No 40]* 7
Problems Seen in Iran, Iraq Exchange of POW's *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 9
TASS Analyst Views Pakistan Election Results 10
Nishanov Previews Talks With Indian Parliament *[IZVESTIYA 24 Oct]* 11
Yanayev Meets With Lebanese Communist Leader *[TASS]* 11
New Ambassador to Lebanon Appointed *[TASS]* 11

East Europe

Lukyanov Receives Bulgarian Assembly Chairman *[IZVESTIYA 24 Oct]* 12
Czechoslovak Prime Minister To Visit 30 Oct *[TASS]* 12
Shevardnadze Receives Czechoslovak Officials *[TASS]* 12
Talks on Troop Withdrawals From CSFR Continue *[Moscow TV]* 12
Lukyanov Meets Visiting Hungarian Party Official *[PRAVDA 25 Oct]* 13
PRAVDA Views Hungarian Commemoration of 1956 *[24 Oct]* 13
Yanayev-Led Trip to Poland Viewed *[PRAVDA 23 Oct]* 13
Army General Arrives in Yugoslavia *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Oct]* 13

West Europe

Reports Preview Gorbachev's Visit to Spain 14
TASS Notes Anticipation 14
Ignatenko Holds News Conference *[TASS]* 14
Gorbachev Interviewed *[PRAVDA 26 Oct]* 15
Gorbachev Dedicates Book to Spain *[TASS]* 18

Gorbachev, Shevardnadze Leave Moscow 26 Oct *[Moscow Radio]* 18
Gorbachev's Upcoming Visit to France Previewed 19
Unprecedented Popularity Noted *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Oct]* 19
French Minister Welcomes Visit *[TASS]* 20
Reports Note Moiseyev's Visit to Belgium 20
Interviewed Prior to Visit *[Moscow International]* 20
Arrives 24 Oct *[PRAVDA 25 Oct]* 21
Meets Belgian Military Leader *[TASS]* 21
Meets NATO's Woerner; Gives Speech *[TASS]* 22
Meets NATO's General Galvin *[TASS]* 22
Gorbachev Greets Austrians on National Day *[TASS]* 22
Nordic Delegation Visits on Soviet Refugee Issue *[Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET 16 Oct]* ... 22
New Ambassador to Norway Appointed *[TASS]* 23
Gas Pipeline Project With Greece Implemented *[IZVESTIYA 21 Oct]* 23
Katushev-Led Delegation Stops in Cyprus *[TASS]* 23

Latin America & Caribbean

Argentine Leader Continues Visit 24
Meets Gorbachev 25 Oct *[TASS]* 24
Leaders Hold News Conference *[Buenos Aires NOTICIAS ARGENTINAS]* 24
Sign Joint Declaration *[Buenos Aires TELAM]* 25
Menem Leaves for Leningrad *[TASS]* 26
New Ambassador to Chile Views Latin America *[IZVESTIYA 17 Oct]* 26

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Decision Published on Revolution Anniversary *[PRAVDA 26 Oct]* 30
Committee Discusses Policies on Women's Issues *[TASS]* 30

Political & Social

Moscow General Details 7 November Parade Plans *[TASS]* 30
New Trade Union Organization Established *[TASS]* 31
Ryzhkov Meets Congress Delegates *[TASS]* 31
Working Groups Hold Meetings *[TASS]* 31
Miners' Congress Discusses Market Economy, Pay *[Moscow Radio]* 31
Reporter Denied Entry to Congress *[PRAVDA 24 Oct]* 32
Kiev District Commander on Military Coup Rumors *[MOSCOW NEWS No 41]* 32
Kryuchkov, Others Discuss Crime Prevention *[IZVESTIYA 23 Oct]* 33
PRAVDA Publishes Law on Public Associations *[16 Oct]* 34
Frolov Holds News Conference on Role of Press *[PRAVDA 25 Oct]* 39
Frolov's Comments Assessed *[Moscow Radio]* 39
CPSU Warnings Against 'Willful Press' Criticized *[IZVESTIYA 14 Oct]* 40
Writers' Leader 'Concerned' About New Press Law *[Moscow International]* 42
Petrunya Allegations Against Youth Paper Rejected
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Oct] 42
Public Figures View KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Oct]* ... 43
Orlov Deflects Criticism of Gorbachev Policies *[TASS]* 43
Tarazevich Says New Union Treaty 'Arduous' Task *[TASS]* 44
Procuracy Official Interviewed on KGB Oversight *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 42]* 44
Soviets, Ispolkoms Functions, Roles Examined *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Oct]* 48
Academy of Sciences Publishes New Journal *[Moscow TV]* 50
Cultural Bimonthly Journal To Be Published *[Moscow Radio]* 51
Gorbachev, Others Sign S.G. Lapin Obituary *[PRAVDA 7 Oct]* 51
IZVESTIYA Reprints Ligachev U.S. Interview 51

Economic

Frolov Praises Communists' Efforts in Lipetsk *[PRAVDA 16 Oct]* 51
Sugar Refineries, Depots Full; Stores Empty *[Moscow TV]* 53
Tomsk Appliance Firm Raises Share Capital *[IZVESTIYA 24 Oct]* 53
New 'Impulse' Fire-Fighting Equipment Described *[Moscow TV]* 53

Scientific

Soviet, Foreign Journalists Visit Chelyabinsk-40 54
City 'Kept Secret' for 40 Years *[NEW TIMES No 41]* 54
Reactor To Decrease Operations *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Oct]* 56
Suspected Cholera Outbreak in Moscow Contained *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Oct]* .. 58

Military

Voronin Notes Military Trade Prerogative *[TASS]* 58
Environmental Committee Protests Nuclear Test *[Moscow TV]* 59
Norwegian Cited on Novya Zemlya Radiation Level *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Oct]* 59
Submarine Sinks on Way to Scrapyard *[Hamburg DPA]* 60
Black Sea Fleet Commander Interviewed on Troops *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Oct]* 60
General Interviewed on Military Aid in Harvesting *[Moscow Radio]* 61
Yazov Defends Need for Heroes' Club *[Moscow TV]* 61
Soviet Warships To Arrive in Vladivostok *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Oct]* 61

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Nordic Council Urges Cooperation With Baltics 62
Independence Supported *[Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET 20 Oct]* 62
Observers Invited To Moscow Talks *[Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 21 Oct]* 62
Coverage of Lithuanian Supreme Council Session *[Vilnius Radio]* 63
Landsbergis Meets Visiting Swedish Delegation *[Vilnius Radio* 65
'Sea Links' Discussed *[Vilnius International]* 65
Bakatin Accuses Landsbergis of 'Delaying' Talks *[Moscow International]* 65
Landsbergis To Appear on Moscow TV Progrm *[Vilnius International]* 65
Ryzhkov Discusses Lithuania-RSFSR Talks *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 23 Oct]* 65
Lithuania's Bickauskas Criticizes Ryzhkov Comments *[Moscow International]* 67
Bickauskas Interviewed on Talks With Moscow *[Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG 20-21 Oct]* 67
'Restrained' Lithuanian Paper Finds Readership *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Oct]* 69
Deputies Protest RSFSR-Estonia Draft Treaty *[MOLODEZH ESTONII 3 Oct]* 69
Further Protestations Noted *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 6 Oct]* 69
Estonia-RSFSR Independence Talks Continue *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 28 Sep]* 70
Estonian Communist Party Membership Figures Noted *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 27 Sep]* 71
Latvian Supreme Soviet Decisions Reported *[PRAVDA 25 Oct]* 72
Latvia's Godmanis Assesses Shevardnadze Meeting *[Riga International]* 72

RSFSR

Coverage of RSFSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings 72
24 Oct Session Reported *[Moscow TV]* 72
Appeals to USSR, Gorbachev *[Moscow TV]* 74
Silayev Stresses Regions' Importance in Reforms *[Moscow Radio]* 74
CPSU's Polozkov To Attend Bashkir Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 74
RSFSR Finance Minister Views Economic Issues *[VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA 12 Oct]* 75
Union Government Losing Support Among Russians *[Moscow International]* 76
Party Secretariat Condemns Democratic Russia *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Oct]* 76
Russian Federation Calls For 'National Trust' *[TASS]* 77
Moscow Railroad To Confiscate Unclaimed Goods *[Moscow Radio]* 78

Social Democrats Open Sverdlovsk Party Congress *[TASS]* 78
Private Newspaper Registered in Kuybyshev *[Moscow Radio]* 78
Irkutsk Oblast Declares Independent Status *[Moscow Radio]* 78
Gorno-Altaysk Soviet Declares Independence *[Moscow Radio]* 78

Western Republics

Coverage of Crisis Situation in Gagauz Republic 79
Call to Arms Deplored *[PRAVDA 24 Oct]* 79
Moldavian Supreme Soviet Meets *[Moscow Radio]* 79
Situation 'Under Control' *[Moscow Radio]* 80
State of Emergency Considered *[TASS]* 80
Army Role Examined *[TASS]* 80
Situation at 'Crisis Point' *[IZVESTIYA 26 Oct]* 80
Situation Being Monitored *[Moscow Radio]* 81
State of Emergency Declared *[TASS]* 81
Further on State of Emergency *[AFP]* 81
Snegur on State of Emergency *[TASS]* 82
New Moldavian Political Divisions Examined *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Oct]* 82
Ukraine Supreme Soviet Amends Constitution *[Kiev International]* 83
Opening of Second Rukh Congress Reported in Kiev *[Moscow Radio]* 83
Economic, Political Independence Sought *[IZVESTIYA 26 Oct]* 84
Belorussian Parliament Approves Sovereignty Bill *[TASS]* 85

Caucasus

USSR Officials Abducted in Nagorno-Karabakh *[TASS]* 85
Renewed Tensions in Nagorno-Karabakh Reviewed *[ARMENPRES]* 85
Armenian Commission Meets NKAO Commandant *[Yerevan International]* 86
Armenian Party Congress Resolution on NKAO *[GOLOS ARMENII 28 Sep]* 86
Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan Sets Policy Objectives *[ARMENPRES]* 87
Shenin Comments on Armenian Party Congress *[GOLOS ARMENII 29 Sep]* 90
Armenian Komsomol Renames Itself 'Youth Union' *[Yerevan International]* 92
Armenian-Azerbaijani Border Conflict Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 21 Oct]* 92

Progress at Vienna CFE Talks Viewed

PM2510102590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Oct 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Candidate of Technical Sciences Colonel V. Chernyshev: "What Will We Cut Back. The Elaboration of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Approaching Conclusion"]

[Text] Could the shortage of time act as some sort of catalyst at the disarmament talks? I think it could, but subject to two absolute conditions. First, given a positive state of relations between participants in the talks. Second, given the sides' sincere desire to reach accord. In this case, the sides are trying to meet each other halfway, putting forward compromise proposals.

This is today's state of affairs at the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe—talks in which all Warsaw Pact and NATO countries are taking part. It must be said straight away that they have not lasted all that long—just some 18 months, since March 1989. But other talks on arms reduction and limitation have by now traversed a much longer path. Look no further than the previous Vienna talks—on reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, in which I happened to participate. They lasted 15 years, and became known among journalists as "Sleeping Beauty." They ended fruitlessly—the "Vienna Beauty" simply failed to awake.

It seems to me that the following factor was of decisive importance in "docking" the Vienna talks with the changed military-political situation. Following a proposal by the USSR, which was backed by all CSCE countries, it was provisionally decided to hold a meeting of heads of state and government in Paris in November of this year. It should lay the foundations of a new all-European security. But some countries, primarily the United States, imposed a condition: The Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe must without fail be ready for signature in Paris.

Of course, quite a lot had already been achieved at the Vienna talks by that time. Agreement was reached that cutbacks should apply to offensive and most destabilizing arms like tanks, armored vehicles, artillery systems, combat aircraft, and helicopters. A common understanding on cutback levels for tanks and armored vehicles was successfully worked out in June. It was envisaged that the Warsaw Pact Organization and NATO would each retain 20,000 tanks and not more than 30,000 armored vehicles (armored personnel carriers and infantry combat vehicles).

But accord on artillery systems, combat aircraft, and helicopters seemed unattainable. For example, the sides' disagreements on the question of setting a maximum level for artillery systems boiled down to this: NATO suggested a ceiling of 16,500 units for each of the blocs, against the 20,000 suggested by the Warsaw Pact Organization. As for aviation assets, the North Atlantic alliance insisted on the treaty extending not only to air force combat aircraft but also to land-based naval aviation. The Soviet Union for its part, evidently quite logically, suggested: If naval aircraft were to be included on the list of arms categories to be cut back, then a certain proportion of carrier-borne naval aviation (on aircraft carriers which are, so to say, "assigned" to Europe) should also be subject to elimination. The Western "logic" was perfectly clear: The USSR has more land-based naval aircraft and the United States has more carrier-borne aircraft—therefore it is necessary to strive to make the first category subject to cutbacks and exclude the second, thus putting the Soviet Union at a disadvantage.

Judging by everything, however, arguments centered mostly on the question of the so-called "sufficiency rule," which sets the maximum level for various arms for individual countries in each of the military-political alliances. NATO was proposing that not a single state should hold more than 30 percent of the volume of weapons in various categories set for the two blocs. The Soviet Union initially felt that this "ceiling" should be at least 35-40 percent, but its position hardened recently and it doggedly insisted on a 40-percent "sufficiency level."

First of all, I would like to mention that maximum limits on the numbers of basic armaments for the two military-political alliances have finally been set. Each one will be able to have 20,000 tanks, 20,000 artillery systems, 30,000 armored vehicles, and 2,000 combat helicopters in Europe. The threshold level for combat aircraft has not yet been announced, but this delay is due to the desire of the USSR and the United States to discuss this question with their allies. Here it is important to stress the fact that, thanks to Moscow's and Washington's joint efforts, the disputed question of both land-based and carrier-borne naval aviation has been successfully and altogether taken off the agenda.

Agreement has also been reached on the "sufficiency rule." Now any country (we are primarily talking about the Soviet Union) will be able to have arms within the framework of the following levels: up to 13,300 tanks (33.3 percent), up to 20,000 armored vehicles (33.3 percent), up to 13,700 artillery systems (34.3 percent), up to 1,500 helicopters (37.5 percent), and up to 5,150 combat aircraft. Thus, the "average" percentage for "sufficiency rule" purposes stands at 33.6 percent.

It can be assumed that the announcement of the aforementioned maximum levels of arms which the Soviet Union can maintain in Europe will provoke an ambiguous response in our country. Some people will say that we have again "given in" and made concessions to the West, deeming the retention levels too low in conditions

when the Warsaw Pact's future existence appears highly doubtful.

What could one say to the "doubters"? First of all, it seems to me that critics should be sufficiently clearly aware that any talks are primarily a matter of bargaining, with each side initially asking for more than it can realistically expect in the end. This is what NATO is doing, we are acting in a similar fashion. And so now, when considering the "sufficiency problem," the side made reciprocal compromises, met each other halfway, and ultimately chose an approximately "median" option of 33.6 percent based on the full range of figures (from the 30 percent "requested" by the West to our 40 percent).

As regards sufficiency in terms of the limits actually set for our arms, some serious thought must be given to this matter. A single country is allowed to have more than one-third of the total volume of arsenals. Is this volume high or low? I think that such an arsenal would be quite substantial, since the remaining two-thirds will be somehow distributed among the more than 20 other Warsaw Pact and NATO states.

In my view, two more factors ought to be emphasized. The first is that the Soviet Union has succeeded in obtaining from the West a highly important pledge: Following Germany's unification, the numerical strength of the FRG Bundeswehr and the GDR National People's Army will be reduced from a total of more than 600,000 to 370,000 men, in other words it will be almost halved. And the second: The NATO countries (specifically the United States, Britain, Belgium, and Canada) are announcing, one after another, forthcoming reductions of their military contingents deployed on Germany's territory, in other words, to use the North Atlantic alliance's terminology, along NATO's "forward defense lines." There is no doubt that all this also leads to an easing of tension.

Changes in World Military Situation Hailed

LD2510214590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Commentary by political observer Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Excerpt] I think that the very fact of our chief of general staff visiting NATO headquarters can be, with exaggeration, called a unique event. Who could have imagined it, well—let's say—just a year ago? However it is not, of course, simply and not so much a matter of the Soviet general visiting the NATO holy of holies, or of the NATO general secretary arriving in Moscow and visiting the Kremlin before that. It is far more important, in my opinion, that cardinal changes in the whole military and political situation in Europe have taken place during the same last year. Decades of the most acute confrontation—frequently called balancing on the edge of war—are being replaced by the creation of general cooperation, including cooperation between the servicemen of various countries.

It seems to me that the last thing is the most important one for the strengthening of universal peace. I remember now the bitter phrase I heard from one of our people's deputies in military uniform, at the recent sitting of the Supreme Soviet: Wars are often initiated by talentless politicians, but for some reason they make it incumbent upon the servicemen to continue and to finish them. Was it not like this, really in Vietnam and Afghanistan? Don't servicemen from various contries have to get to know each other to rid themselves of stereotypical images of the enemy in their own way of thinking?

I think that the recent visit of General Moiseyev to the United States was rather useful in this respect. During his visit he was not simply meeting his American colleagues, and visiting a number of apparently supersecret facilities; he also came to an agreement about the broadening of contacts between the armed forces of the two countries, from meetings between commanders of various brances of the Army to visits between military ships and air force subunits. [passage omitted]

New European Alliance Plans Termed 'Ill-Timed'

LD2510182490 Moscow TASS in English 1638 GMT 25 Oct 90

[By TASS political observer Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS—The proposal to establish a new defence alliance within the EC framework was voiced at the recent meeting in Brussels of the foreign ministers of the European Community's member-countries and the leaders of the Europarliament and the Commission of European Communities. The meeting decided to submit the matter for consideration to the European Council summit in Rome in late October.

Present chairman of the Commission of European Communities Jacques Delors originated the idea of creating a defence alliance within the EC. He first voiced it four years ago, but the idea was torn apart by the public and the governments of the 12 member-states shelved Delors' proposal.

It was revived by Delors recently and is now being debated extensively. The discussion of plans to expand EC functions to the military field has gone so far that Ireland, one of the EC members, has started to think about shedding its neutrality.

The Delors initiative assumes that the creation of the military union will naturally follow the creation of the political, currency and economic union within the European Community.

But is it really necessary or unavoidable for the Community to assume military functions?

The EC leaders seek to avoid a direct answer to this pivotal question. There appears to be no absolute necessity to create such a defence alliance, all the more so since Europe is heading towards a common European home. Will this home need a new artificial partition devised by the EC?

I believe that the Delors initiative is at variance with positive tendencies of the present European situation. A situation that is characterised by the termination of the cold war era and the transfer of East-West relations from confrontation to interaction, including on matters of European security.

The second Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) is due to meet in Paris in November. The summit is expected to consider, among other issues, the creation of new continental- scale collective security structures within the CSCE framework.

A legitimate question arises in this connection: Aren't plans to involve the EC in military activities ill-timed? Is the participation of the EC member-states in NATO and the West European Union, which are endowed with functions in the military field, not enough? These plans acquire a special significance in view of the radical reorganisation of the Warsaw treaty organisation.

Some observers believe that the creation of a defence alliance within the EC frame is designed to manifest Europe's independence from the United States. But Western Europe is sufficiently independent as it is. What is the point of staging yet another affirmation at a time when the interdependence of states is growing stronger and deeper?

In addition, building a common European home is inconceivable without the participation of the United States, as is the creation of collective European security structures.

The appearance of a new defence alliance on the map of Europe will not impart greater confidence to inter-state relations. It would sooner engender uncertainty in the morrow and undermine the drive towards stronger trust and mutual understanding in international relations.

UN Envoy Addresses Coordination Committee

LD2510222390 Moscow TASS in English 2108 GMT 25 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Kochekov]

[Text] New York October 25 TASS—USSR Permanent Representative to the United Nations Yuliy Vorontsov said today that numerous attempts over the past 45 years to perfect coordination in the United Nations system have not justified the hopes of the U.N. member-countries. As a result the present state of coordination in the U.N. system does not satisfy anyone, he said. He addressed tme joint meeting of the United Nations Committee for Programme and Coordination and the Administrative Committee on Coordination.

There are many reasons for this state of things and they have [words indistinct] there is a lack of consensus on some or [words indistinct] other questions among delegations representing various countries in intergovernmental bodies. There is a lack of coordination in the stances of delegates of one and the same state representing its interests in various organisations in the U.N. system.

The Soviet delegate pointed to the existence of centrifugal tendencies in the leadership of special U.N. institutions. Executive heads of these institutions regard the efforts to increase coordinationnin the U.N. systems as the encroachment on their prerogatives by the U.N. centre.

The Soviet representative emphasised the need for an open and constructive dialogue on this matter at such a unique forum as joint meetings of these two committees. In these committees representatives of member-countries and executive heads of international organisations have an opportunity to exchange opinions and coordinate strategy.

He said that it is extremely important to select problems, the solution of which could have tangible financial and administrative effect.

United States & Canada

Cheney Interviewed During Moscow Visit

91UF0064A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Oct 90 Second Edition p 5

[Interview with U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney by N. Belan in Tula on 18 October: "'I Look Ahead With Optimism'"]

[Text] **Quite recently it would have been impossible—an American military delegation headed by the U.S. defense secretary visiting Soviet paratroopers at facilities that cannot be shown even in our Soviet press. But today, because of the new political thinking, glasnost, and perestroyka, the veil of secrecy has dropped, and military servicemen—American and Russian—warmly shook one another's hand. The terrifying image of the enemy that existed for so long is being dispelled....**

I met U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney in the training center of the Tula airborne division where on 18 October the guest learned about the military equipment and arms and also the methods of training Soviet paratroopers. In spite of the shortage of time, he kindly agreed to give a brief interview to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

[Belan] Mr. Minister, we would like to know your impression of what you have seen among our paratroopers.

[Cheney] This is the first time I have had the opportunity to visit Soviet subdivisions and units. Why the Air Force in particular? In the first place, they are of special interest to me. In the second place, when USSR Defense Minister Marshal D. Yazov was in the United States we offered to show him the 82d Airborne Division.

The level and quality of the training of your paratroopers makes a strong impression. Your officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted personnel are highly professional, and I was especially impressed by their training which was demonstrated to us at the psychological combat training complex. And, of course, I found out several new things today. I had never before seen, for example, how the jet braking system is used when landing with parachutes from planes for transporting heavy equipment. We do not use this system but you are using it successfully. So I am very satisfied with the day I have spent here.

[Belan] Your visit to the USSR is regarded as another step toward strengthening mutual confidence between our countries. I would like to know your opinion about how this confidence is being fostered between the armed forces of the United States and the USSR, what it is based on, and what could still threaten this "fragile vessel," as it were?

[Cheney] I think we have already accumulated positive experience in strengthening confidence in one another as a result of the exchange of delegations. It is very important that we conducted them and that we have drawn more and more representatives of the military of both sides into this process. I thing that mutual understanding and trust enrich us and remove our uneasiness about one another.

As for the threat, this question does not bother me now. What could threaten us? Nothing. I do not think there will be a reverse process. We are looking ahead with optimism, for the relations between our political leaders, like those between the defense ministers of our countries, are developing well. The process of arms control is also advancing favorably, and I am sure that we will progress successfully in the future. I am an optimist.

[Belan] But not everything in the world is peaceful today. What is your prediction of the development of events in the Persian Gulf?

[Cheney] The situation there is difficult to predict now, there is much that is unclear. I hope that the efforts of the international community with the participation of the United States and also the Soviet Union will lead to a peaceful solution to the problem. If, of course, president Saddam Husayn respects the UN resolution concerning the withdrawal of troops from Kuwait. But for now, I repeat, the situation is completely unclear and full of uncertainty.

[Belan] Mr. Secretary, the development of all kinds of contacts and the work for strengthening mutual confidence undoubtedly depend on individuals. This is the second time you have met with our defense minister, Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Yazov. What is your opinion of him.

[Cheney] Both my wife and I have a deep feeling of communication with this person. Minister Yazov is a person with a great deal of military, professional experience and knowledge, a person who is devoted to his people and his country. He was a participant in World War II—or the Great Patriotic War as you call it—and we, representatives of my generation, can learn a lot from people of Minister Yazov's generation.

We have good professional and personal relations with him. My wife is impressed by how well read he is and by his knowledge of literature—not only Russian but also English and American. This is a person who understands deeply that we have now entered a new era of mutual understanding between our peoples and states and that the prospects for these relations are favorable now. And if we concentrate our efforts in the direction of the development of these relations in conjunction with representatives of our governments, I do not rule out the possibility that our relations will become even warmer and better in future years. I sincerely believe this.

[Belan] Thank you, Mr. Cheney, the Soviet people share your optimism and confidence.

U.S. Has Mixed Feelings About Trade With USSR

91UF0062A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
13 Oct 90 Union Edition p 6

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Shalnev: "'Buckwheat' for Dollars (How America Will Help Us)"]

[Text] New York—Here is what we have come to.

A certain San Francisco firm has placed its ads in the emigrants' press. The correct addresses of all their compatriots working in the United States, as well as former citizens now living in America, offering to "fill the empty refrigerators of your loved ones with tasty and rare foods." Their plan is simple: The goods are paid for in the United States and received in the USSR.

The delivery time can beat every record—five days in Moscow oblast and 15 to 20 days anywhere else in the USSR. The firm offers four combinations of goods for the family and friends, priced from $94 to $205.

The selections are very typically "for us": starting with canned ham, canned crabmeat, and black caviar, and ending with buckwheat, boxes of cookies, halvah, and tea. The firm also offers to put together "baby food packages," "family first-aid kits" at $109 each, and "children's first-aid kits" at $70.

It was not to embroider again the subject of flexibility, efficiency, and success of the private initiative that I started writing about the businessmen from San Francisco who were flooded with requests from people wishing to fill the empty refrigerators of their loved ones in the USSR. As I see it, such economic links make up that very "optimal" version that we can expect from America in the near future.

It is becoming more and more obvious now that we will not move any time soon beyond the formula "money first, goods second" in our relations with the American business world. This business world is prepared to support perestroyka and our push to a market economy, but this preparedness exists mostly on paper, as they offer only such goods and services for which payments cannot be doubted for a second. A recent example of this can be the agreement with "Philip Morris"—a company that is prepared to supply us with over 20 billion cigarettes by the end of the next year. However, this company, as we were reminded again by THE NEW YORK TIMES, insisted on very rigid payment terms, which included payments in crude oil, gold, and diamonds.

We agreed to many of the terms that gave "Philip Morris" an opportunity to suggest that their products would grab 20 percent of the Soviet tobacco market within a few years. That, of course, if we have a sufficient amount of crude oil, diamonds, gold, caviar, etc. "Philip Morris" would not seriously suppose that during these few years the Soviet economy is going to stand firmly on its own two feet, create a convertible ruble, and become equal, in its model and not in its volume, to the American economy.

The company is not alone in such thinking. The 500 days program that is being discussed tempestuously in the USSR is being also tempestuously discussed in the United States. Almost unanimously it is being treated as a giant and inevitable thrust forward. But.... even its enthusiasts—I mean American economic experts—have to display a certain amount of skepticism about how feasible the program is and how attainable its goals are. Richard Erickson, working for the Harriman Institute of USSR Studies under Columbia University, cannot hide his amazement: "I cannot imagine," he says, "how you can set up a bank system within a hundred days." As R. Erickson emphasizes, the program promises a lot more than it can deliver.

Rather a grim assessment was given by Ed Hewitt, an economist from the Brookings Institution who is considered one of the most prestigious experts on Soviet economy and who also has extensive connections in the Soviet politico-economic establishment and that includes the circles that gave birth to the 500 days program. According to THE NEW YORK TIMES interview with him, he thinks that the USSR is facing many more years of political and economic whirlwinds.

Whirlwinds are not the type of climate that would please the business circles; they are not prepared to take this amount of risk without any serious guarantees justifying such risk.

Guarantees of that nature can be government ones, of the type extended, for instance, by the Export-Import Bank of the United States. But the Soviet Union cannot get such guarantees because of certain acts adopted in the mid-seventies that have been linked to our readiness to weaken or totally eliminate any restrictions on emigration from the USSR. They expect an entry-exit law from us and they are not going do us any favors in advance. One high-ranked White House official, who did not want his name known, said: "The policy of normalizing trade and economic relations with the USSR, as outlined by President Bush, has not been changed." In other words, the linkage remains.

The White House official was asked about the present status of the Washington policy connected with increasing demands by certain sectors of U.S. business circles that the government guaranteed credits making it possible for the USSR to buy American products, primarily of an agricultural nature. These demands are voiced mainly by farmers and by those who forward their interests on Capitol Hill and in the cabinet of ministers.

According to THE NEW YORK TIMES information, last year the USSR bought $3.3 billion worth of agricultural products in America. It was in the same year, continues the newspaper, that the USSR warned about diminishing considerably the volume of future purchases if there were no American credits. You can imagine the state farmers are in: First, they are facing again the problem of overproduction; second, if one can judge by the draft of the next year's federal budget, they can

expect a drastic reduction of both hidden and direct government subsidies. Farmers are extremely interested in foreign markets. But the federal administration is in no hurry to help them and approve the credit that could have been guaranteed through the Ministry of Agriculture.

Why not? The fact that we still have not passed an entry-exit law does not seem to be the only obstacle, I have to admit. The main reason is that the highest administrative circles feel unsure about the future situation in the Soviet Union or in such ethnic entities into which the Soviet Union may be split. Such apprehensions and lack of belief are not discussed publicly. But there are some comments in the wings and, if I can judge by the ones I happened to hear, they are radically different from the public speeches.

When they say that one or the other point of view "is widely discussed," it by no means suggests that the point of view has been accepted as part of the official policy. But neither can it be ignored by the people in the administration responsible for the final decisions.

The debates that are taking place now in the political and business worlds of the United States concerning their relations with the Soviet Union will undoubtedly get much more heated due to the latest news from Moscow: Various Soviet organizations still owe a total of some $3.5 billion in payments on the signed and completed contracts. As was mentioned in THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, "the payment crisis turned out to be a lot more serious than it was presented by the Soviet Government that promised to resolve the issue by the end of September." The crisis, continues the newspaper, makes Western bankers quite nervous the moment you start talking about offering trade credits, unsupported by iron-clad guarantees.

The San Francisco firm that offers to sell food for USSR consumption, the firm that trades according to the principle "money first, goods second" has struck upon the tendency quite accurately.

Near East & South Asia

Reports Continue on Primakov's Middle East Tour

Meets With Syria's Al-Asad

LD2510142490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1401 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] Damascus, 25 Oct (TASS)—A meeting between Ye.M. Primakov, special representative of the USSR president and member of the Presidential Council, with H. al-Asad, president of Syria, took place here today.

Ye. M. Primakov is in Damascus as part of his mission for holding consultations with the leaders of a number of countries in relations to the crisis in the Persian Gulf region. In the course of the talks, various aspects of the situation relating to the Kuwaiti crisis were discussed in detail. The sides noted the need to seek ways toward a political settlement of the explosive situation.

Relays Message From Gorbachev

LD2610110690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 26 Oct 90

[Text] Negotiations between Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad and Primakov, special representative of the USSR president, have taken place in Damascus. Primakov is undertaking a new trip to the countries of the region in order to find ways of settling the crisis in the Persian Gulf. Primakov handed a message from Gorbachev to al-Asad. The member of the USSR President Council told journalists that consultations in Damascus are being carried out in order to coordinate the efforts of the two countries in connection with the crisis in the Persian Gulf.

Returns to Cairo 26 Oct

LD2610111490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1045 GMT 26 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Krutikhin]

[Text] Cairo, 26 Oct (TASS)—Ye.M. Primakov, special representative of the USSR president and member of the Presidential Council, arrived back in Cairo today after a one-day visit to Damascus. This evening he is due to be received by Egyptian President Husni Mubarak.

The aim of the Soviet representative's mission is to hold consultations with the leadership of a number of countries in connection with the crisis in the Persian Gulf region.

Mideast Coverage Noted

WA25101700

For reportage on the visit by Yevgeniy Primakov to Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq, including reports on his talks with Egyptian President Mubarak, Syrian President al-Asad, Saudi Arabian Foreign Minister Sa'ud al-Faysal, and Iraqi officials, please see the relevant sections of the 25 October Near East & South Asia DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

Toughening Sanctions Against Iraq Favored

LD2510182390 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Commentary by Yuriy Solton]

[Text] The Soviet president has again dispatched his special envoy Yevgeniy Primakov on a peace mission to the Middle East and southwest Asia. The program of the tour includes another meeting with Iraq's President Saddam Husayn. In early October, Primakov made his first trip to the region. Later he went to some Western capitals, including Washington. Will Moscow's shuttle diplomacy to gain a peaceful solution of the Gulf crisis be a success? Yuriy Solton comments:

What Primakov discussed with Arab and Western leaders is kept a secret, and this is understandable. The special envoy himself maintains that his talks yielded some positive results. In Cairo he said we must be optimistic, a war in the Persian Gulf would be a catastrophe, we have not exhausted all opportunities in our search for a peaceful settlement yet.

It is clear that Moscow is seeking to create conditions to resolve the crisis by political means acceptable to all, writes Yuriy Solton. In my view this task can be accomplished. There are resolutions adopted by the UN Security Council; there is the Soviet-American top-level agreement reached in Helsinki; and they all state unambiguously that Iraq must leave Kuwait unconditionally. Baghdad must not be allowed to gain benefits from its aggression; this would create a dangerous precedent. So when Iraqi leaders in their endeavors to sound public opinion began to hint at the possibility of partial settlement, their [word indistinct] is to enter into negotiations, and the need to link a settlement in the Gulf to the solution of other problems in the region, international response, except for the reaction from some Arab countries and the Palestinians, was unanimous: No compromise, no linkage.

Baghdad received the same response to what Secretary of State James Baker described as a hostage bazaar, that is, when Baghdad decided to release small groups of foreign specialists in the hope to weaken the anti-Iraqi front, its diplomacy of fear did not work either. Its threats to use foreign specialists as live shields in case of a military conflict and resort to chemical and bacteriological weapons, have only added to the resentment of the other side. American senators for instance believe that even after Iraq leaves Kuwait it should be denied all arms sales, and that everything in human power should be done to prevent it from repeating its adventures.

In the meantime the Pentagon is considering the possibility of sending more troops to the Persian Gulf area. Reporting this, THE NEW YORK TIMES has said that the proposed reinforcement of the American contingent in Saudi Arabia might be another [word indistinct] of preparations for an offensive. So despite the efforts exerted by the Soviet Union and other countries the sliding toward war continues. In my view a war can be prevented only by toughening UN sanctions against Iraq in order to induce it to leave Kuwait in the near future unconditionally.

Peace Committee Delegates Meet Kuwaiti Envoy

LD2510205790 Moscow TASS in English 1813 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS—Soviet peace champions express profound concern over continuing tensions in the Persian Gulf, the Soviet Peace Committee has said in a statement.

Opposing the use of military force in solving any complex problems, the Soviet Peace Committee has resolutely condemned Iraq's aggression against Kuwait from the very beginning and its subsequent occupation and annexation.

In connection with the International Day of Action for Peace in the Gulf, October 26, the peace committee stressed the need to defuse the explosive situation in the region, as soon as possible, through the simultaneous withdrawal of both Iraqi troops from Kuwait and all foreign troops from the conflict zone.

The delegation of the Soviet Peace Committee met Kuwaiti Ambassador 'Abd al-Mohsen al-Du'ayj and handed him the text of the committee's statement.

The delegation also intended to hand the text of the statement to the Iraqi ambassador, but the latter refused to meet them, and the text was left at the embassy's dispatch office.

Open Letter to Gorbachev on Gulf Published

91UF0076A Moscow SOVETSKIY PATRIOT in Russian No 40, 1-7 Oct 90 p 10

[Article by independent Russian journalist Yevgeniy Rusanov: "An Open Letter to the President of the USSR—A Few Thoughts About the Events in the Persian Gulf"—passages in italics are set off in box]

[Text] Mr. President!

The pro-American press of the West and the Soviet sources of mass information echoing it are persistently trying to restore world public opinion against Iraq without explaining the true causes of the conflict in the Persian Gulf. Mr. President, your letter of ultimatum to the Iraqi president, Mr. Saddam Husayn, merely joined the harmonious chorus of indignation of the "strong of this world."

A feeling of protest was evoked in me not only by the ease with which you walked away from your business partner and your friendship with him but, mainly, by the fact that you, Mr. President, IGNORING THE AGE-OLD TRADITIONS OF THE RUSSIAN STATE TO BE ALWAYS INDEPENDENT, RETAINING ITS UNIQUENESS IN COMMUNICATING WITH THE OUTSIDE WORLD, it would seem, followed the lead of the so-called "world government" which is more and more openly demonstrating its dictatorship in the internal affairs of the majority of countries of the New and Old Worlds.

That is my opinion, which I could not keep to myself at such a critical juncture. Let this letter be another piece of documentary evidence of the hatred for any political manipulations and deals in which the Man of the Planet is ensnared today.

When 13 "righteous men" intend to beat or are beating one "sinner" it is clear to anyone with common sense

that something is wrong. And anyone who is not a coward will stand up for the person who is alone. Such is the situation with Iraq. **We are being forced to make a judgment without the elementary right to figure out for ourselves what is going on and to form our own opinion, not under bombardment by the repetitious words of commentators but on the basis of the real facts and official documents. But we are familiar neither with the statements of Saddam Husayn nor with his Address to the Arab World nor with the justification for his actions. Why are these documents being kept from us?**

What made the president of Iraq resort to such a desperate step, tearing away from international capital such a tasty morsel as the flourishing Kuwait—a city with numerous staff headquarters for the intelligence services of foreign states and luxurious private dwellings of large-scale wheeler-dealers? For a long time now no head of state has dared to ignore the threatening shout of a superpower in such an open and insulting way. For a long time now nobody has dared to show such resolve in the face of an attack from a nuclear armada! One against all! Base people are hardly capable of this kind of opposition! The president of Iraq, rejecting the self-confident order from Britain and the United States, is prepared to go to the end to defend the interests of his country and his people. Does this not evoke a feeling of respect, even from an enemy?!

The United Nations has condemned Iraq and declared an embargo against it. BUT WHO ARE THE JUDGES?

The United States of America. A country that is controlled by a pro-Zionist lobby? A country that tries with the power of the dollar and arms to dictate its conditions for existence to everyone. A country which itself has conducted hundreds of secret and overt treacherous invasions of other states? (Remember Grenada, Panama, and so forth.) But why has the United Nations never once declared an embargo against America? Or perhaps the role of judge is claimed by Israel, which has occupied the territory of the Arab states and is ignoring world public opinion and the resolution of this same United Nations?

Or the Soviet Union, "where man breathes so freely," still not knowing what he has built over 70 years, in which state he is living, and who rules him and by what right?! And what kind of "bright future" is this which has cost more than 100 million lives?!! The truth has still not been told about the unprecedented bloody genocide! We do not have the complete truth about 1917. We do not know the truth about our last war with Germany. We do not know who is really to blame for the Afghan adventure. We do not know the truth about the Chernobyl tragedy. We do not know the truth about national rebirth. How can we have hope in anything or believe anybody's promises when we are carrying around this heavy load of lies?! Just a couple of years ago the West—which, we are told every day, will be our savior and benefactor tomorrow—considered the USSR "aggressor number one," referring to its invasion of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Afghanistan, which took the lives of tens of thousands of young men. Today this same Europe, along with the States, are fraternizing with us, the "aggressors"! Aggressors are fraternizing with aggressors behind the backs of the people!

Can Great Britain, France, and Germany be judges in the Near East conflict when they too have repeatedly used armed force against other states?

The Arab World, as Saddam Husayn said, can straighten the situation out itself without any help from the U.S. Navy. A quite definite statement. But what in it is so unclear to those who have crowded to the Persian Gulf?

And looking deep into the history of Russian power, how can one fail to understand that Russia, too, is capable of emerging from its own crisis into which it was driven with a whip 70 years ago! It can get out without the degrading gifts from "kind Uncle Sam" and other "civilized philanthropists" who have stripped and plundered our country dozens of times in direct interventions and under the pretext of economic aid, who have plundered us with loans, transactions, foreign trade establishments, and lend lease deals. The West has pumped and is pumping the blood—petroleum and gas—from the body of our land very cheaply, it is ripping apart our valuable covering—the forests, and it is turning the interior of our earth into a radioactive rubbish dump. The West has never been our honest partner and ally and it never will be since the non- national governments that have harnessed the people have a different task: Russia, independent and unique, must disappear! To replace it they long ago earmarked a kind of subsidiary, underground part of the Common European Home. Along with "freedom" of the market, our "sponsors" across the ocean hope to place a new collar on the neck of the Russian peoples, but this time with firm labels.

IT IS TIME TO WAKE UP FROM THE NARCOTIC! WE STILL LIVE ON EARTH WHICH, IN SPITE OF ALL PARTY DOGMAS, IS PRODUCING, THANK GOD, UNPRECEDENTED HARVESTS! Even what remains after the plundering of Russia's wealth today guarantees all of its peoples a standard of living higher than that of the Europeans! So why are we panicking, Mr. President, and why are we rushing, our heads thrown back, into the jaws transnational traps?! Is it really so difficult to look into the PAST when Russia fed not only herself but all of Europe as well?! What is keeping us from being aware of the experience that has already been accumulated, the power that has already been demonstrated, and the ability that has already been proven?! **We are strutting our "new" thinking. But, excuse me, today's so-called perestroyka is just a shadow of the 1907 program of that great state champion STOLYPIN. Once he is familiar with this program, everyone who can still feel the pain over the lost greatness of our country will be convinced that its complete fulfillment means the salvation of Russia in our day! And so at each step the past, the mistakes and successes that have accumulated, can**

resolve any problems of the modern day and open up the path to the future. But the "bricklayers" building the common European home have different plans. They want to bury the past. This is why they have no desire to take up the Code of Russian Laws and see their simplicity and wisdom. It is dangerous for them to look into the annals of Russian diplomacy which has always been confident of a strong rear—the invincible power! The lessons of the historic victories of the Russian Empire frighten them! They are frightened by the large role played in these victories by the RUSSIANS who have been forced to become Soviets during the past 70 years! But in spite of common sense and the experience of generations they are trying to discard the national factor from the accounts of human life. Only people perverted by easily gained power for the benefit of the "world community" can push through the nonsensical idea of mankind's existence without nationalities! Another trap! Those who are seated at the top of the world pyramid today will never forget which nation they belong to or for which idea they are subjugating the world. And this is of no small importance—they are subjugating it by taking advantage of the structures of monarchic power deliberately discredited in the eyes of the current innocent generations.

Mr. President! Since the Russian monarch NICHOLAS II, there has been in Russia a game of leapfrog with leaders who have turned out to be in all ways absolutely unsuited to bear the burden of power. "Every housewife," alas, cannot control the state. The unvarnished truth has subjected to justifiable contempt all those who have tried to clamber up to the Russian throne under the cover of Marxist promises. And I shall allow myself to predict that this will continue in the future until we begin to reckon FROM PAST EXPERIENCE, until we are aware of the real causes of our decline. Until our points of reference become the truths and atemporal, eternal ideas and not slogans for the needs of the day. Until the spiritual takes precedence over the material. This is the way things will continue in the future unless we finally raise the siege from the national principle of nations. This is the way things will continue unless the powers that be stop waging their fruitless struggle against the NATIONAL IDEA OF RENEWAL!

Russia has her own unique path which is not the same as any other and which has been marked out for her by a thousand-year history. To stray from this path—to Euro-Americanize Russia—is a hopeless occupation. And a criminal one. Neither Bush nor Thatcher can help us renew ourselves. Nothing outside of Russia can help! Our wise ancestors always thought that the main thing was to arrange life within the country and external affairs would take care of themselves. And they were not mistaken. Herein lies the key to our real rebirth today. But will the cosmopolitan West allow us to assume our real face? Apparently the time is near when all Russians will need the resolve of Saddam Husayn. For it is time to decide on something for the sake of millions of innocent victims.

I request, Mr. President, that you serve only the people!

[Signed] Yevgeniy Rusanov, independent Russian journalist

Instead of a Commentary

Such is the document. The orthography and style have been retained in keeping with the original.

What does this letter show us? Above all, that democracy is returning to our country. After all, five years ago could "some journalist" really have addressed the first state figure so simply? The "nut house," prison camp, expulsion, firing, and so forth—one can only fantasize about what would inevitably have happened to him. Of course there could have been no question of the appearance of such a document in the central press. Now times are changing. Another matter: To what extent was the author right, where did he go "overboard" in his burst of inspiration, what did he fail to take into account in his considerations? And these questions we address to you, esteemed readers. Do not be in a hurry to jump to conclusions. Think and compare.

Problems Seen in Iran, Iraq Exchange of POW's

NC2510133590 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 24 Oct 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] The exchange of POW's continues between Iran and Iraq as new problems keep cropping up. Some time ago, both sides agreed that those military personnel who had been convicted of violations during their incarceration should be granted amnesty and should be released and included in the exchanges.

Iran has raised the issue of the release of Mohammad Javad Tondguyan, the former Iranian petroleum minister, who was captured by Iraqi forces when the war broke out. According to documents to which Iran has access, the rumors of his having been killed are unreliable.

As we know, Baghdad's recognition of the Algiers accord reactivated the POW exchanges. In Tehran, it was hoped that this process would be completed by 22 September, the tenth anniversary of the commencement of Iran's retaliation for the attack on Khuzestan. This would have made it possible for the Iranian regime to celebrate a complete victory on that anniversary.

However, fantasies do not conform to political and propaganda figures. It transpired that the exchange of POW's is one of the most difficult issues. This is true because of the fact that Baghdad has its own interpretation of the war's initiation and its reasons for doing so and wishes to counteract Tehran's propagandistic clamor.

The main issue is that consequences of war are heavy, fraught with hardship, and totally unpredictable. For example, it has been divulged that many Iranians do not wish to return to their homeland. A member of the

Iranian committee, involved in the POW exchanges, stated recently that Iranian POW's in Iraq contacted some International Red Cross representatives groups and the Mojahedin-e Khalq Organization, an Iranian opposition group, and decided against returning to their homeland. He expressed regret about this.

As we know, Iraq had similar complaints that some Iraqi POW's had been subjected to psychological manipulation in Iran and had joined the ranks of the opponents of the Baghdad regime. It appears that psychological influences have been effective in the choice of the place of residence and attitudes of the POW's of both sides.

However, this is not the only determining factor. Today in Iran and Iraq, conditions prevail which make the POW's dread a return to their respective homelands. In Iran, there is a regime which does not tolerate any divergent modes of thought, and those who have these thoughts are persecuted. Thousands are languishing in dungeons merely because they hold dissident beliefs and opinions.

In addition, Iranians, especially those who were in military uniform, were dispatched to the blazing crucible of a war which did not end simply. In the horror of the raging inferno of the war, they realized that war is itself the result of a lack of tolerance and patience, as well as of the high-flying fancies of dictatorial regimes.

Till such a time as these regimes are liberalized and society is democratized, the homeland will represent a center of coercion and torture for its offspring. Of course, in addition to being plagued with these thoughts, the POW's are now they are faced with other difficulties. They have just been liberated from the horrors of a war, and they do not wish to go into another fratricidal war in Kuwait. A war incapacitates people not only physically but also morally.

The people of the Soviet Union regained belief in this reality by the participation of Soviet forces in Afghanistan, and this war has also created the still unresolved problem of the release of Soviet soldiers from imprisonment. It appears that political and social circles in Iran and Iraq can create better conditions for the fate of the military POW's of the two countries by their efforts to democratize their respective societies and by a democratic resolution of the Persian Gulf crisis. This is a humanitarian obligation which no one has the right to disregard.

TASS Analyst Views Pakistan Election Results

LD2510181390 Moscow TASS in English 1535 GMT 25 Oct 90

[By TASS political news analyst Yuriy Tyssovskiy]

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS—The elections to the national assembly have ended in Pakistan. Predictions about a win by the People's Democratic Alliance, of which the Pakistan People's Party headed by Benazir Bhutto is the core, did not come true.

The majority of votes were cast for the multi-party Islamic Democratic Alliance (IDA)—a political group unified by a desire to prevent Bhutto from returning to power.

It is pointless at this stage to dwell on the internal ramifications of the electoral results.

Many analysts are concerned about which foreign policy course an IDA government will choose, after it is formed on the basis of the parliamentary majority.

The alliance enjoys wide support in the military establishment and overtly orients itself towards the political course that was pursued for more than a decade by the late dictator Mohammad Ziaul-Haq.

Under Ghulam Ishaq Khan, the ISI—the Interservice Intelligence—is known to have continued to play the role of a kind of foreign policy agency, with even broader powers than the Pakistani Foreign Ministry.

A foreign policy planned by generals is always a dangerous thing. Tension in the region has escalated over the past 12 years. Islamabad's anti-Afghan ventures, the policy of confrontation with India, the nuclear ambitions of the emerging military-industrial complex, claims to regional hegemony backed up by massive purchases of up-to-date Western arms—all help destabilise the situation on the subcontinent.

If continued, such a policy could produce chaos, and there are signs that Islamabad intends to proceed precisely along that road.

On Wednesday THE LOS ANGELES TIMES newspaper reported that U.S. officials believe that Pakistan had already developed a nuclear bomb.

Washington always winked at the actions of Ziaul-Haq and his political successors: A Pakistani nuclear programme, overt violations of human rights, thriving trade in and smuggling of narcotics. All was written off under "the frontline state's special role as the United States' leading ally in asia".

Cold-war terminology, however, is receding into the past. The White House, Congress and the U.S. public are taking a more sober view of Islamabad's actions.

A new Pakistani Government has a chance to proclaim that it is ready to lead the country towards establishing goodneighourly relations with the states of the region, towards peace and social progress.

The future will show whether the burden of the IDA's political heritage will allow the government to do this.

Nishanov Previews Talks With Indian Parliament

PM2510085190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 90 Union Edition p 4

[Report on interview with R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, by TASS correspondent; place and date not given: "Ties Between Parliaments Strengthened"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] An Indian parliamentary delegation is coming to the Soviet Union. On the eve of the visit, a TASS correspondent talked to R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities. In answer to a question about the role that joint efforts on the part of USSR and Indian parliamentarians can play in generally improving the international situation and settling current conflicts, he said:

First of all, I would like to note that there is a solid base for joint efforts between Soviet and Indian parliamentarians in the international arena—the long tradition of multifaceted cooperation on many levels between the USSR and India on a whole range of global and regional problems. The quintessence of our joint experience in this sphere as well as the real prospects of fruitful cooperation are contained in the ten principles of the Delhi declaration—the historic document of the new political thinking. It can be said without exaggeration that Soviet and Indian parliamentarians, who express their peoples' fundamental hopes, are in the forefront in understanding the crucial nature of the moment and introducing into international practice a new concept of peace which provides reliable guarantees for the survival of mankind.

Speaking about the concrete possibilities for cooperation between Soviet and Indian parliamentarians in the current conditions, I would like to draw attention to a recent USSR Supreme Soviet address to parliaments and the world community appealing for a final end to nuclear weapons testing. The achievement of this aim would be an important step on the path to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and a triumph for ideas at the basis of the Delhi declaration. It seems that a firm opinion from Indian parliamentarians in favor of a complete ban on nuclear weapons testing would undoubtedly raise the prestige of Indian foreign policy even more and would strengthen the position of the planet's peaceable forces.

Another prospective sphere where the united efforts of Soviet and Indian parliamentarians could produce tangible results would appear to be assistance in the creation of a structure for cooperation in the Asian-Pacific region with the aim of turning this area into an region of peace, security, and cooperation. In our view, it would be good for the Soviet and Indian parliamentarians to jointly think about holding a representative conference of the Asian-Pacific countries' parliamentarians in order to examine the region's topical problems. Such a forum could also discuss questions connected with the settlement of existing conflicts in the region, including the Near East conflict.

Both the Soviet Union and India are actively participating in the international community's efforts to unblock the crisis situation that has arisen in the Persian Gulf area as a result of the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait. Our countries are collaborating in resolving questions connected with the settlement of this problem —suffice it to mention that the USSR and Indian foreign ministries have discussed various aspects of the new exacerbation of the Near East situation at two recent meetings.

Yanayev Meets With Lebanese Communist Leader

LD2410202190 Moscow TASS in English 1958 GMT 24 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS—Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Gennadiy Yanayev met a delegation of the Lebanese Communist Party led by its general secretary George Hawi.

The sides informed each other of the activities of their parties and favoured stronger relations between the CPSU and LCP. They discussed the situation in the world, developments in the Middle East and the Gulf.

Turning to the situation in Lebanon, the sides stressed the importance of rallying all the Lebanese behind the national concord charter. They noted that the Lebanese people should support efforts by legitimate authorities to restore peace and stability in the country.

New Ambassador to Lebanon Appointed

LD2410203790 Moscow TASS in English 1514 GMT 24 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS—Gennadiy Ilichev has been appointed Soviet ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Lebanon.

The previous previous ambassador, Vasiliy Kolotusha, has moved to another job.

Ilichev, born in 1938, is Russian. He graduated from the Moscow Foreign Relations Institute in 1963.

He embarked on his diplomatic career in 1963, working at the Soviet Embassy in Kuwait (1963-1966), the Middle East Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry (1966-1968 and 1972-1974), at the Soviet Embassy in Syria (1968-1982).

He was first secretary of the Soviet Embassy to the Yemeni Arab Republic between 1974 and 1978, counsellor and section head of the Middle East Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry between 1978 and 1982, and envoy-counsellor of the Soviet Embassy in the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen between 1982-1988.

He was deputy directorate head of the Middle East and North Africa Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry between 1988 and 1989. Since 1989 he has been senior counsellor of the Middle East and North Africa Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry.

East Europe

Lukyanov Receives Bulgarian Assembly Chairman

PM2610085790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 90 Union Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Friendly Conversation"]

[Text] A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, met with Academician N. Todorov, chief of the Bulgarian Grand National Assembly, who was in Moscow, 22 October in the Kremlin.

During the friendly conversation, questions of the further improvement of Soviet-Bulgarian relations were discussed in the light of the new realities that are forming in both countries. The need was stressed to activate ties between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Bulgarian Grand National Assembly and their committees and commissions in the interests of resolving concrete problems of interstate cooperation and strengthening security and stability on the European continent.

Czechoslovak Prime Minister To Visit 30 Oct

LD2610102890 Moscow TASS in English 2518 GMT 26 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 26 TASS—Czechoslovak Prime Minister Marian Calfa will pay a working visit to the Soviet Union on October 30, it was announced here today.

Shevardnadze Receives Czechoslovak Officials

LD2510162590 Moscow TASS International Sevice in Russian 0805 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow, 25 Oct (TASS)—Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze yesterday received a large group of political figures, diplomats, experts from a number of ministries and departments, and eminent academics from the CSFR, who came to Moscow to participate in a bilateral scientific-practical symposium on the subject: "Soviet Union-Czechoslovakia: Prospects for Developing Relations."

It was noted during the conversation that the free and constructive exchange of opinions between academics and practical workers from the two countries makes it easier to discern one another's views and to juxtapose them so that the new start made in Soviet-Czechoslovak relations might be founded on good- neighborliness, accord, sovereign equality, and mutual benefit. This is of particular importance under the present difficult conditions created by the Soviet Union's and Czechoslovakia's transition to market relations and their quest for solutions to many other acute problems of social development.

It was also pointed out that preserving everything positive in their relations, built up over a lengthy period of history, could and should be an important factor in joint action between the two states.

Those at the meeting recognized the pressing need to pay primary attention to restructuring bilateral relations, based on juridical agreements, and to do so by taking as a starting point the present realities and being guided by the desire to conduct a mutually frank and truthful dialogue to facilitate the success of the transformations in the two countries.

R. Slansky, CSFR Ambassador to the USSR, participated in the conversation.

Talks on Troop Withdrawals From CSFR Continue

LD2510212290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Report by correspondent V. Beletskiy, including interview with CSFR National Assembly Deputy M. Kocab; from the "Vremya" newscast—Kocab's remarks in Czech with superimposed Russian translation; recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Today in Moscow a working meeting took place between members of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Committee on State Security and a delegation of the CSFR Federal Assembly's Committee on Defense, State Security, and the Armed Forces.

[Beletskiy] Property and financial questions connected with the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia were discussed. Already 58 percent of the soldiers have returned home, as have half of the family members of officers and warrant officers. Most military equipment and weaponry has also been withdrawn.

The Soviet side drew the attention of their colleagues to the fact that not all the agreements previously achieved have been observed by the Czechoslovak side. In particular, there is some uncertaintly with regard to deliveries to the USSR of prefabricated houses and hostels for housing for families of Soviet soldiers. The USSR people's deputies consider that it is expedient to implement these deliveries in payment for the value of the bases belonging to the Soviet Union in Czechoslovakia.

[Kocab] I must say that the withdrawal of Soviet troops is taking place within the established timetable, in implementation of the timetable earlier planned by both sides. And in this sense, we are completely satisfied.

I would also like to mention the meeting yesterday with Mr. Shevardnadze, who said that Soviet soldiers are leaving Czechoslovakia as friends of that country. This gladdened us greatly.

Lukyanov Meets Visiting Hungarian Party Official

PM2610102790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 24 October, G.I. Yanayev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met with I. Szekeres, member of the Presidium and secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Party Central Committee, who is in Moscow at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, and had a talk with him on questions of cooperation between the CPSU and the Hungarian Socialist Party under the new conditions.

PRAVDA Views Hungarian Commemoration of 1956

PM2410134990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 90 Second Edition p 5

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent V. Gerasimov under the rubric: "Eastern Europe": "On the Events of 1956..."]

[Text] Budapest, 23 Oct—In Hungary 23-24 October 1956 were days marked by particular drama. "Counter-revolutionary events"—that was how they were long interpreted in the country. Now, however, 23 October has been declared a state holiday. The "beginning of the revolution and the liberation struggle" are connected with it.

Hungarian television has been showing documentaries. They show fratricidal clashes, the ransacking of the Hungarian radio committee building and the party's Budapest city committee, and the tearing down of a monument to Stalin. On 1 November, the Imre Nagy government that had then been created announced the country's withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact. Hungarian neutrality was proclaimed.

In introducing our troops into Hungary, our country took account of the Hungarian communists' direct requests. The action was forced upon us [vynuzhdennyy] and tragic. During those days 2,502 Hungarians died. Later around 300 people were sentenced to death, including Imre Nagy himself.

Today Hungarians are laying wreaths on the graves of those who died 34 years ago. At the same time many people still call the events of fall 1956 a "counterrevolution" and disagree with the present official assessment of them. The tragic events need thorough study and objective and varied assessments.

Yanayev-Led Trip to Poland Viewed

PM2410193290 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 90 First Edition p 4

[Report by A. Starukhin: "Meetings on the Wisla"]

[Text] A CPSU Central Committee delegation headed by G.I. Yanayev, Politburo member and secretary of the Central Committee, has visited Poland at the invitation of the Social Democracy of the Polish Republic [SdRP] party. There were meetings and conversations in Warsaw and Szczecin during which questions pertaining to the development of the political situation in Poland and the USSR, relations between the two countries, and exchange of experience in a number of spheres were touched on. Your PRAVDA correspondent asked G.I. Yanayev to share his impressions of the trip.

[Starukhin] "What can you say about the results of the trip?"

[Yanayev] "In my view, the visit was very important. We wanted to express solidarity with Social Democrats and all left-wing forces in Poland, to compare and analyze certain things. It seems to me that our sense of mutual involvement has always been valuable, and particularly now, since the Polish left and, above all, the SdRP are going through a pretty difficult time in their development. Our meetings with the party leadership in Warsaw and with the aktiv give grounds for asserting that left-wing forces remain loyal to the socialist idea and instill hope that this difficult period is of a temporary nature. I saw many young people who have recently linked their destinies to the party and it is gratifying that experienced fighters and veterans are filled with a desire to defend the interests of the Polish people and are prepared to apply their energies to improving and activating Polish-Soviet relations.

"The national interests of the Soviet and Polish peoples are intertwined, by and large. I would like to stress our mutual economic interests in particular. We cannot approach one another from the position that someone always owes someone something. We favor the development of normal, mutually advantageous trade and economic ties. But, returning to my impressions of the visit, I have to say how clearly we sensed that the Polish public is massively committed to seeing perestroyka in the Soviet Union overcome all its difficulties as soon as possible and to the USSR's remaining a strong, unified state pursuing a clear-cut policy. For my part, I want from the bottom of my heart to wish the SdRP and all democratic left-wing forces in the country success and I want to declare loud and clear my solidarity, sympathy, and support with regard to the great and difficult work the SdRP is currently carrying out."

Army General Arrives in Yugoslavia

PM2610084390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Oct 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Belgrade, 23 Oct—Colonel General N.I. Shlyaga, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, arrived yesterday on a visit to Yugoslavia at the invitation of the SFRY Federal Secretariat for National Defense. He met with Colonel General M. Cusic, SFRY deputy federal secretary for national

defense. The sides exchanged experience on the questions of Armed Forces building in the two countries, the enhancement of the Armed Forces' combat readiness, and the political and moral training of the personnel. Topical international problems and the prospects for cooperation between the USSR and SFRY military departments were discussed.

On the same day the Soviet guest visited the "Josip Broz Tito" Memorial Center and laid a wreath at the grave of the former president of the SFRY and leader of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

West Europe

Reports Preview Gorbachev's Visit to Spain

TASS Notes Anticipation

LD2510135390 Moscow TASS in English 1312 GMT 25 Oct 90

[By TASS special correspondents Vladimir Malyshev, Vladimir Reshetilov, Robert Serebrennikov, Vitaliy Chukseyev, and Vladimir Shekhovtsov]

[Text] Madrid October 25 TASS—Soviet flags fluttering on Madrid streets are intertwined with the purple attire of Platans. The Spanish capital is preparing to welcome President Mikhail Gorbachev who will arrive here on Friday on a three-day official visit.

"The present visit is an important event in the political life of our country. It is of historic significance," Felix Pons, president of the Spanish congress of Deputies, the lower house of the Cortes Generales (parliament), told TASS.

"It is the firt time that the head of the Soviet state will be in Spain. This visit takes place at a time when Europe is undergoing sweeping changes. These changes have largely been generated by Gorbachev's policy of new thinking. This policy opened doors to transformations that have spread to the entire continent. Changes are occurring with a rapidity that nobody expected. The idea of a common European home is close and understandable to all. Europe should not be divided into Western and Eastern parts. All of us should live under a single roof," Pons went on.

Asked to comment on the state of interparliamentary ties between the two countries and prospects for their development, Pons said: "We have ample opportunities for boosting ties between legislative branches in Spain and the USSR. We hope that the Soviet president's visit will enable us to utilise them."

Spanish Foreign Minister Francisco Fernandez-Ordonez told TASS that during the visit, the two countries would sign 12 agreements, several important treaties, a joint political declaration and a memorandum on consultations between the two countries' foreign ministries.

"A lengthy talk will take place between Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez and President Gorbachev. We will try to make the most of the visit to take a new step forward in our relations with the USSR," Ordonez emphasised.

"In our view, the top level visit to one of Europe's largest countries with a dynamically developing economy is an important international event as well as a great contribution to the development of economic ties," Enrique Ibanez, general director of the state-run company Telefonica International, believes. He emphasised that the transition to a market economy, launched by the Soviet leadership, would help intensify Soviet-Spanish exchanges.

As usual, the visit has a very hectic programme. Cultural cooperation features prominently in it.

In a TASS interview, Alfonso Perez Sanchez, general director of the famous Prado Museum, said that the museum cooperates broadly with the Hermitage and Pushkin museums. They exchange exhibitions and visits by the two countries' art critics. "Art is a unique language of communication for all nations. Therefore, culture is an important instrument for mutual understanding and strengthening friendly ties between countries," Sanchez said.

Gorbachev will visit Spain not only as the head of the Soviet state but also as the laureate of the Nobel Peace Prize. The award dominates headlines in Spain, says Spanish playwright Antonio Buero Vallejo: "We cordially welcome the decision to award the Nobel Peace Prize to Mikhail Gorbachev. This move accords with the interests of peace."

Madrid is beautiful in autumn attire. Golden leaves mix with the bright greenery of lawns in numerous parks against the backdrop of foamy jets of water sprinkling from fountains. It is the first time ever that the crimson flags of the Soviet Union are fluttering on its ancient streets. Preparations are in progress here for the Soviet president's groundbreaking visit. Furnishing one more piece of evidence of profound changes occurring in Europe and the world.

Ignatenko Holds News Conference

LD2510143890 Moscow TASS in English 1414 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] Madrid October 25 TASS—On the eve of President Mikhail Gorbachev's official visit to Spain, Soviet Presidential spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko held a news conference here today.

Ignatenko spoke of the programme of the president's visit. He said that a package of agreements is expected to be signed during the visit, including an agreement on scientific and technological cooperation, a consular convention and an agreement on combating drug trafficking.

The sides are also planning to sign agreements to settle legal problems and develop cultural ties. Ignatenko said Gorbachev would meet representatives of business circles.

Gorbachev Interviewed

PM2510182090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 90 First Edition pp 1, 2

[Interview of President Mikhail Gorbachev by Madrid EL PAIS; place and date not given—"M.S. Gorbachev's Answers to Questions From the Newspaper EL PAIS"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] [EL PAIS] What do you see as the aim of your visit to Spain? What are your interests in Spain? How do you assess your relations with Felipe Gonzalez' Socialist government? Do you think that Spanish businessmen are prepared to invest in the Soviet economy?

[Gorbachev] I think I will have to address this topic repeatedly during my stay in your country. For the moment I will be brief.

We are going to Spain mindful of its growing, creative role in elaborating European and not only European policy. I can state with satisfaction: Our countries' positions on fundamental issues are very close and often coincide, and we have no problems that create any significant difficulties for the development of our relations.

They are developing successfully. But Moscow and, as I know, Madrid are not entirely satisfied with the pace and the specific content of these relations. Indeed, there is great potential for expanding and deepening collaboration.

Another point: We have and indeed can have no suspicious interests in Spain. We are in favor of mutually advantageous and mutually useful relations. There is specific interest in your country's comparatively recent experience, in the experience of its transition to democracy and a modern market economy. I am sure we will learn much that is interesting.

I have twice met with Felipe Gonzalez—briefly in 1985, and in 1986, when we had a long, sincere discussion which I would describe as full of creative elan. We have not personally met since then, but we maintain regular contact. And I greatly value my high level of mutual understanding with your premier.

Are Spanish businessmen prepared to invest in our economy? I will put that question to them at our meeting in Spain. As for us, we are interested in this and we are creating favorable opportunities for this which match up to generally accepted standards.

We note that among Spanish business circles there is a growing interest in and taste for work in the Soviet market and the establishment of direct links with Soviet industrial enterprises. By way of illustration I would mention the cooperation in modernizing light industry enterprises, the construction of "turnkey" enterprises by Spanish firms, and the creation of joint ventures. Twenty-seven of these have already been registered, and 22 of them are in operation.

I think that Spanish entrepreneurs should act more vigorously and compete more boldly with businessmen from other countries, who are now displaying tremendous interest in us.

[EL PAIS] Did you foresee the consequences of the transformations that have shaken the former socialist camp? Could you have influenced the course of these transformations, and did you not lose control of them?

[Gorbachev] As I understand it, you are referring to the changes in East Europe that occurred or, to be more accurate, began there last year. I emphasize—began, because we are talking about processes that are by no means finished.

In fact, there was no need to possess the gift of prophesy. The changes in East Europe were caused by reasons similar to ours.

I think that the very terms of the question—did the Soviet Union not lose control of these processes—are a diversion from the crux of the matter. Our position was stated with the utmost clarity five years ago: The Soviet Union rejects interference in the internal affairs of other countries, including its allies, and is irrevocably committed to the principle of freedom of choice. We have no intention of retreating from this position.

Of course, when we began perestroyka we tried to explain its aims, reasons, and nature to our allies and neighbors. We did not always meet with understanding from everyone—and we knew why that was so. But we did not repeat past mistakes and we did not have any intention of imposing our "model" on anyone. Just as we do not want—indeed, we are unable—to "control" internal processes in our neighboring countries.

The preservation, strengthening, and development of bilateral relations with our neighbors on a new, absolutely equal and mutually advantageous basis are a different matter. It is a matter of preserving and augmenting everything positive, everything good and mutually advantageous, while renouncing everything negative that has overshadowed our relations. And there have been positive things, this cannot be denied if you base yourself on facts and the truth.

When it comes to the consequences of the transformations in East Europe, then I hope that they too clear the way to a new, peaceful European order in which each country will find its place and will be able to fully ensure its own interests while respecting the interests of others.

[EL PAIS] How do you see the Soviet Union's place in the future geopolitical structure of Europe?

[Gorbachev] A good question. Admittedly, it is hard to give an altogether specific answer to it—the new structure of the all-European home, or the all-European confederation, or the European new order, call it what you will, is still only at the formative stage. But in general I would like to highlight two aspects.

First of all the Soviet Union hopes for full and organic collaboration with all European countries, the United States, and Canada—also in the context of the European process. We are prepared to and we want to take an active part in resolving all European questions, including the status of a new security structure and a continent-wide system of collaboration in the economy, ecology, energy, information, and culture. Europeans can resolve these and many other questions only together.

Now the voices of opponents of a new peaceful Europe that is united in its diversity have fallen silent. But does this mean that their owners have vanished? Does this mean that all problems have been removed and that all the prejudices and motives bred by the "cold war" and the atmosphere of hostility have been eliminated? Of course not. And Europeans still have substantial work to do to make themselves proof against throwbacks to the past and attempts to take "ideological revenge" or "settle scores" over the past. And to this end interstate relations must be finally rid of any ideological influence.

The other aspect is this, again in general terms: The European system of cooperation must not be a closed system. The future geopolitical structure of Europe must be connected with similar structures in other parts of the world. That is the only way the Soviet Union, as a country of which a considerable part is in Asia, can see world politics, including European politics.

A sensible, vigorous, and purposeful policy in the Mediterranean is of great importance to both the USSR and Spain, and also, of course, to other southern European, Near Eastern, and North African countries. We welcome the initiatives put forward by Spain in this connection and we believe that their implementation will be conducive to a peaceful and prosperous future for all countries of a region that is so significant to a great many peoples and states.

[EL PAIS] Has the USSR ceased to be a superpower? How long can the "honeymoon" in Soviet-U.S. relations last? What events may end it?

[Gorbachev] I think the time of superpowers is past. The very concept is a product of the "cold war."

The burden of responsibility for maintaining peace that is borne by major states with a unique economic and military potential like the USSR and the United States is a different matter. Neither we nor the Americans can simply jettison this burden without jeopardizing world security. Neither we nor the Americans are entitled to cease efforts aimed at limiting the nuclear arms race and ultimately eliminating nuclear arms. Of course, not everything depends on our two countries, but a very great deal does. Therefore the demands placed on the USSR and the United States are higher than those placed on others.

Now for the second part of your question. Admittedly, I do not know how appropriate your playful metaphor is when applied to such a serious problem as relations between the USSR and the United States. But if you mean that these relations are cardinally changing for the better, then you are right. The growing mutual understanding and cooperation between our two countries and peoples is being built on a firm foundation. We hope and expect that we are entering upon a long and stable period of normal, healthy relations of partnership with the United States.

In this respect we are greatly encouraged by the fact that these relations have been tested by the dramatic changes in East Europe, and that the first extremely acute international crisis since the end of the "cold war," which has erupted in the Persian Gulf region, has not disrupted but has strengthened Soviet-U.S. collaboration. This shows that we have struck the right note in joint efforts to create a safer and fairer world order.

[EL PAIS] For many observers, the Soviet Union's position on the Persian Gulf crisis shows that for the first time the USSR is acting like the West, not like the East. Do you think that this opinion is correct?

Despite its condemnation of the Iraqi aggression and its support for the relevant UN resolution on an embargo, the Soviet Union has still not taken any measures to exert military pressure, as many Western countries have done. How far is this behavior determined by a reluctance to arouse a negative reaction in the USSR's Moslem republics?

[Gorbachev] I think that the opposition between East and West which has become second nature to us all is losing its former meaning. So it is wrong to assess the Soviet Union's position on the Persian Gulf crisis as a transition from an "Eastern" to a "Western" position. It is merely confirmation that the world is changing substantially.

The Persian Gulf crisis is a kind of alarm warning of the persisting danger of a return to the times of the policy of force and aggression.

The world community's ability to act in accordance with the new criteria of international policy and its ability through joint efforts to force the culprit behind the conflict to obey the norms of international law are now being tested in the Gulf. For the first time in many decades the UN Security Council's decisions showed a unique solidarity among the most diverse countries, based on an awareness of the responsibility that unites them all—the responsibility for maintaining peace and stability.

So far as we are concerned it is indisputable that aggression and violence, whatever their source, must be condemned and stopped by collective measures under the auspices of the United Nations. Double standards are ruled out here.

The conflicts in the Near and Middle East, including the chronic Palestinian problem, are continuing to deteriorate.

We believe it is possible to avoid a military explosion and we are doing everything in our power to secure a political settlement.

This course is supported by all republics of the Soviet Union, including those where the population is mostly Moslem. I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to note that Islam, like other religions, calls for peace and tolerance, not for the fueling of enmity and hatred.

[EL PAIS] Do you believe that you personally are needed to ensure the further development and success of the policy of perestroyka in the USSR?

[Gorbachev] I will begin my answer by saying something that I have said more than once before. Perestroyka was not conceived by one person, it did not originate in a single head. It was dictated by life, by the objective logic of the preceding development of our society. Perestroyka was called upon to wrench the country from the shackles of a very difficult past, and therefore crisis phenomena were inevitable along its path.

Life ordained that a special responsibility fell on me. I have no intention of sidestepping this responsibility.

Perestroyka, you might say, has become my destiny. And as long as I receive support and trust, I will persistently continue what has been begun, and do everything in my power to ensure that perestroyka succeeds.

[EL PAIS] What kind of Soviet Union would you like to hand on to your successor?

[Gorbachev] Perestroyka has now entered a critical stage. We have made our choice. The transition to the market has been initiated, a multiparty democratic system is taking shape, and the fundamentals of a new, unprecedented state structure—a Union of Sovereign States—are being elaborated. We have opened ourselves up to the outside world and we are participating actively in the establishment of a new universal peaceful order. Our objective is to make the country an organic part of the general civilized world process.

Naturally, perestroyka cannot resolve all problems. This is impossible as such. Nor do we aspire to some kind of ideal, sterile society in which there are no contradictions or conflicts. I think that we are all ridding ourselves of illusions of this kind. We will establish democratic mechanisms which will enable us to overcome contradictions with a minimum of pain, to find optimum solutions for the problems that arise, and to synthesize the interests of various social groups, strata, nations, and peoples. I believe that we can make substantial headway in the next few years.

I want to see my country prosper, I want it to be a country in which each and every person can live freely and well, in which everyone is able to develop their abilities and realize their potential. The country is not something general and abstract for me. It is people, citizens. And the main thing is to ensure that their economic, political, ecological, cultural and moral environment is the best one possible.

[EL PAIS] Mr. Gorbachev! Here is a question which attracts much interest in the West: Do you continue to regard yourself as a communist, and what constitutes communism in your opinion? Does perestroyka, as an attempt at radical transformations of the Soviet society, not resemble Lenin's New Economic Policy [NEP]?

[Gorbachev] This raises a number of questions at once, and relatively complex questions too. Incidentally, I have already spoken on similar topics.

To begin at the end, it is true that the period in which we are living could be compared with the transition to the NEP in the twenties. Then, as now, society had reached a turning point. Unfortunately many people at that time failed to grasp the depth of Lenin's design, perceiving the NEP at best as a tactical move. And this had most serious consequences for the country.

Of course, this parallel must not be taken literally, times have changed. The new epoch demands a new interpretation of the very concept of socialism, and a resolute and irreversible break with everything that linked this concept with the administrative-edict system and Stalinism.

Some people, both in our country and abroad, are advising that the whole socialist idea simply be discarded.

I categorically disagree with this, and not just for personal and moral reasons. The socialist idea is rooted in the depths of human culture. Its emergence and development was brought about by objective contradictions in history which no one can remove, just as it is impossible to stifle people's striving for specific ideals of justice and a decent life. The socialist idea does not rule out a market economy, or parliamentary democracy, or human rights and freedoms. In general, it is rooted, as regards both its essence and origins, in universal human values.

Furthermore, and this is of fundamental importance, for the majority of our people a renunciation of the socialist idea would be tantamount to trampling the memory of the heroic feats and unbelievable efforts of the many generations which October 1917 roused to conscious historical creation. And it is not their fault that their

feats and the sacrifices they made did not bear the fruits they hoped for, either for themselves of for their children and grandchildren.

For me, being a communist means espousing the socialist idea, and democratic socialism as an ideal. Its philosophical interpretation is under way, including during the drafting of the new CPSU Program. I believe that in this theoretical and political quest much that is new lies in store for us.

[EL PAIS] Are you satisfied with the economic aid which the West is giving to the Soviet Union? Do you need anything else?

[Gorbachev] I have expressed my views on this subject more than once, the last time only a few days ago at the USSR Supreme Soviet session.

Therefore I will confine myself to this. We highly appreciate the attention shown toward our perestroyka and the understanding of what it means, including for the world as a whole. We note with satisfaction the readiness to give us actual economic support, especially during the next few months when we must stabilize the situation, which is unthinkable without the normalization of the consumer market and money circulation. We are counting on solidarity and hope that it will be business-like, timely, and tangible so far as our population is concerned.

In general, our objective is, I repeat, to join the mechanism of the European and world economy and the world financial system as equal partners. This is precisely why we are developing contacts with the European Communities and GATT, and why we are establishing ties with the World and European Banks for Reconstruction and Development and the IMF. While seeking good partners, we must, of course, become reliable and advantageous partners ourselves, and we will do so.

I take advantage of this opportunity to convey good wishes to the readers of your renowned newspaper.

Gorbachev Dedicates Book to Spain

LD2510154690 Moscow TASS in English 1504 GMT 25 Oct 90

[By TASS special correspondents Vladimir Maliyshev, Vladimir Reshetilov, Robert Serebrennikov, Vitaliy Chukseyev, and Vladimir Shekhovtsov]

[Text] Madrid October 25 TASS—"Towards a New European Home: A New Policy for Europe and the World" is the title of the book by President Mikhail Gorbachev, which a major Spanish publisher, "Circulo de Lectores," have brought out in time for the Soviet leader's forthcoming visit to Spain.

The book comprises speeches, interviews and articles by the Soviet leader over a period of time from July 1989 to June 1990.

These include Gorbachev's widely acclaimed address at Sorbonne University, at a session of the parliamentary assembly of the Council of Europe, at the Vatican, at Stanford University and at the extraordinary Third Congress of Soviet People's Deputies.

Gorbachev's address to Spanish readers with which the book opens, says:

"The Circulo de Lectores publishers asked me to address a few words to Spaniards in connection with the publication of the third collection of my works.

"They encompass a brief but very important period. The Soviet Union is now going through a difficult, indeed critical phase in its history. The country seems to have quit the old system but has not entered a new one. I hope that the materials in this collection will help those interested to better understand what is going on in our country, what problems confront us, where we are heading and how we plan to build our relations with the outside world.

"It is quite obvious today that perestroyka's success will largely determine the world as it enters the 21st century. But this success in turn will depend on the world's readiness to support our efforts, to show solidarity with us in the cause upon which the fate of civilisation is hinged.

The peoples of our countries have long sympathised with each other and showed interest in each other. In recent years, relations between the Soviet Union and Spain—at the state, public and cultural levels—have become more dynamic and more substantial in a new way. At the same time, old traditions of our spiritual and intellectual links and exchanges have been revitalised.

"I have never been to your beautiful country, Spain, about which I naturally know much. I hope my wish to see it will materialise one day.

"I take this opportunity to wish my readers, and through them, the whole friendly Spanish people peace and prosperity."

Gorbachev, Shevardnadze Leave Moscow 26 Oct

LD2610090190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 26 Oct 90

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev left Moscow on his official visit to Madrid today at the invitation of King Juan Carlos I. The USSR president will also visit France at the invitation of the French president.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is accompanied by Comrades Shevardnadze, Voronin, Nazarbayev, Chernyayev, and Romanovskiy.

At the airport the president was seen off by Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet; members of the USSR Presidential Council Bakatin, Boldin, Kryuchkov,

Maslyukov, Medvedev, Osipyan, Shatalin, Yazov, and Yakovlev; and Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Among those seeing him off there were Panes, Spanish charge d'affaires ad interim in the USSR, and Peissik, French charge d'affaires ad interim in the USSR.

Gorbachev's Upcoming Visit to France Previewed

Unprecedented Popularity Noted

PM2610082590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 90 p 3

[Article by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent N. Dolgopolov: "The Women Shouted 'Hurrah'—But What Can We Buy With the 'Gorbachev Trust Credit'?"]

[Text] Paris—No time at all has passed since his last visit to Paris in July 1989, but it seems like an eternity: Such are our changes and disasters at home. Just over 20 agreements were concluded at that time, but for some reason, in spite of all their importance and significance, I remember more clearly something quite different: The Place de la Bastille, impossibly jam-packed with people a full half an hour before Mikhail Sergeyevich [Gorbachev]'s arrival here, was an alarming spectacle. There were neither the usual police cordons, nor any checking of passes. A horde of reporters, photographers, and all manner of operators rushed to meet him and the elegant Raisa Maksimovna. Frenzied gapers hurried after them, sweeping past the modest protective barriers. For the first time it hit me what mass exultation could turn into. My ears thumped from the heartrending shouts of "Gorby! Raisa! Gorby!" I am no expert, and so I do not know where the French security service was, or more correctly, was not. Ours, however, closed ranks, forming a first, then a second semicircular chain round the Gorbachevs. It was no longer a time for protocol. The public in the square were being borne along like some flimsy raft on a raging sea. Gorbachev was still trying to speak, to answer. It all took restraint, even courage.

This is a quality which is unquestionably demanded of the president. Especially right now, today. After all, the first five-year period of Gorbachev foreign policy is behind us. Perhaps the Nobel Peace Prize for overthrowing and destroying the old and the obsolete is the period at the end of an impressive, quality first volume?

Will it do as an opening to volume two? This one will be harder to compose: The state's foreign policy must meet the interests of the center and of each republic—I will not undertake to write how many of them have accumulated now. I list only the strategy. Will it be allowed to be realized? Will it not be stifled by our own homegrown crisis?

Just read what the American financier George Soros [name as transliterated], who has set up a foundation for aid to East European countries, writes on this subject: "The historic opportunity to reform the economy with a far-reaching renewal of Soviet society has been lost. But the opportunity could arise again, because, to be sure, even worse political and economic chaos will follow. And this may compel Mr. Gorbachev to accept what he is now rejecting—if a military coup does not remove him first." Harsh, cruel, categorical. And what is his conclusion? He is even more hard-hitting: "...The West must afford Gorbachev emergency aid. It must provide all possible technical assistance and training in order to prepare for the day when, notwithstanding, a new version of the Shatalin plan is implemented." It appears that it is Gorbachev who remains the guarantor of international material backing for the Soviet reforms. It is possible to speak of Reagan traveling the road from hawk to peacemaker and of Mitterrand's farsighted, acrobatic diplomacy. About the far from ordinary personality of Britain's Iron Lady. It is understood over here all the same that it was not this pleiad which accomplished the switch from the cold war to different standards of measure. The popularity of the Soviet president abroad is without precedent. For the time being we are being given aid "on Gorbachev's credit."

But is the credit of trust which he has been offered unlimited? Our terrible domestic problems put pressure on the West as well. In France, for example, calls for caution are heard more and more often: Let us wait, let us see whom we should conclude agreements with, whom we should offer credit to. Indeed, there are plenty of claimants—the center, the republics, medium and small enterprises, not to mention large ones. It is all very confusing. If the same number of official, and by-no-means official, delegations were to arrive in other European capitals, let alone Moscow, the hotels would be choked with Soviet guests. Paris can cope with them. The visitors look round, make proposals. But they knock down their price as well, they conclude contracts below the level not only of world prices, but also below generally accepted, reasonable prices. In West Europe we are accused of dumping, and not gratuitously or without corroboration—a dozen or more antidumping investigations have been opened. Just grab something, squeeze out a few francs, dollars, or piasters. And even these crumbs are not sent to the union, but are settled in banks over here, bringing in minimal interest only for those who possess them, and for Frenchmen. It is inhumanly difficult to change people's views and persuade them. If things carry on like this much longer we will turn into gatherers of the charred remains of a bonfire the size of one-sixth of the planet. And meanwhile we really do not understand whether we have started to lay the foundations or whether we are still bogged down in quarrels over the design.

Support is needed. And not just moral support. Moral support is all well and good. But it is nothing compared with credits, technology, and the repeal of antiquated COCOM [Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Exports Control] vetoes on the supply of goods. About 20 years ago, as a student finding myself in the West for

the first time, I believed that, if we would not catch them up and overtake them, then we would draw closer to them. Spending time there in the eighties I understood clearly that there is no chance of that. If we were developing at all then, it was an arithmetical progression. But they, joining together and uniting their forces, were developing in a vertical, upwardly soaring, geometrical progression. Our—and I mean our our—CEMA had become an artificial myth. The ideological bubble, not supported by the economic one, burst sooner than had been envisaged. And the much-trumpeted Warsaw Pact, in the words of Marshal Akhromeyev, will end its activity as a military organization "soon, even very soon, possibly in 1991."

Where does salvation lie? In the blackest, most cheerless work that we have grown out of the habit of performing. Indeed we have smashed away and cut down the best Russian workers, the sloggers who were capable of putting their backs into their work.

To admit this is painful, sorrowful for the national consciousness, but essential: We cannot clamber out of the hole without their help. We have to open the borders to foreign capital and investments, allow them in, and on favorable terms. It is tragic, but it is the way out. It is said that they will defile Russia. That means that we have to fight to stop them doing so. But if we stay closed, the country will fall into an economic abyss more terrible than the abyss that was called the Tatar-Mongol yoke.

Gorbachev has yet to achieve his main task at home.... Consequently, difficult trips abroad lie ahead. This is the purpose of the Spanish and French visits. In France he is awaited without the long-gone euphoria, but in a businesslike manner. Judging by newspaper reports, the preliminary talks held on neutral Austrian soil between the two foreign ministers, E.A. Shevardnadze and R. Dumas, have been fruitful. A document has been prepared with a title, proposed by the French, that promises much—Treaty on Concord and Cooperation. The two ministers are unanimous: It looks toward the future.

French Minister Welcomes Visit

LD2510194890 Moscow TASS in English 1734 GMT 25 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Khrekov]

[Text] Paris October 25 TASS—The Soviet Union and France are bound by long-standing friendship and cooperation, and the French side is sincerely satisfied by the upward trend in relations recently, Jack Lang, French minister of culture, communications and major public works and prominent leader of the French Socialist Party, told TASS.

The minister said that Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to France and scheduled summit and the signing of fundamentally important bilateral documents are of huge importance.

He said that there is high esteem and love for the Soviet president in France. He will go down in history as the politician who unfettered the vast potential of human reason and initiative and set vast masses of people in motion. It can be rightfully said that the Soviet president put an end to the division of Europe which had lasted for four decades, and an end to confrontation in Europe. He is a man of great political courage and initiative who actually started a peaceful revolution in the Soviet Union, Lang said.

Ties between France and Russia began long ago. Ideas have been exchanged between the two countries' intellectuals for many centuries. This exchange promoted the common goal of developing the potential of the two countries and all of Europe.

Not everything has always been smooth in Franco-Soviet relations, particularly in the early eighties, Lang said. "Frankly speaking, we suffered from a certain coolness between the two countries. But France, a country adhering to the ideas of freedom and democracy, could not but feel a hostile attitude to a state with an undemocratic system, where human rights were flouted. We hope that these times are gone. It is precisely thanks to the Soviet president's activity that the French and Soviet peoples resumed friendly relations," Lang said.

Intellectuals in the two countries are meeting each other halfway as regards prospects for Franco-Soviet cultural cooperation, the minister said. The French State is doing its utmost to expand this exchange.

France has a multitude of possibilities for intensive cooperation, in cinematography, for instance. The Soviet Union is a prominent centre of the film industry in the East, while France is the biggest centre of cinema in the West, the minister said.

The two countries should pool their efforts. The French National Cinema Centre has created a mechanism for this interaction. A special foundation has been set up. It allocates funds for co-productions. There is now an excellent example in co-production—the film "Taxi Blues" by talented Soviet film director Pavel Lungin. It had a veritable triumph at the latest international film festival in Cannes. "We hope that in the years ahead there will be many such wonderful examples of cooperation, enriching European culture," the minister said.

Reports Note Moiseyev's Visit to Belgium

Interviewed Prior to Visit

LD2510173690 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Interview with Army General Mikhail Moiseyev by Moscow Radio's Colonel Vadim Solovyev—passages within quotation marks recorded in Russian with superimposed English translation]

[Text] [Announcer] The Soviet Armed Forces chief of staff is visiting NATO Headquarters.

Radio Moscow's Vadim Solovyev, a colonel, met with Army General Mikhail Moiseyev before he arrived in Brussels.

He comments:

[Solovyev] "The NATO headquarters is opening its door to Army Gen Mikhail Moiseyev. The Soviet Ministry of Defense believes that energetic military contacts must produce an international mechanism to rule out war. Agreements are being outlined to reduce weapons, provide for reducing Soviet (?and) American nuclear arms, scaling down NATO and Warsaw Treaty military potentials, and laying down more principles of relations between the two alliances.

"Gen. Moiseyev had this to say:

[Moiseyev] "We are trying to find solutions, and we compromise, even perhaps to the detriment of our own defense capability. This country's negotiating partners understand this perfectly well. The question has, by and large, been solved at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva for reducing strategic offensive weapons. Those talks produced a principled agreement to bring down nuclear warheads to 6,000 and delivery vehicles to 1,600.

[Solovyev] "General Moiseyev also said some positions remain to be coordinated at the Vienna talks for conventional armed forces in Europe, and this is exactly what the Soviet Union is trying to do:

[Moiseyev] "Some of the Warsaw Treaty nations have moved away from the initial quotas. They have decided to build up their own Armed Forces at the expense of this country's quota. This country cannot agree with this on some points. We determine today the tanks, aircraft, infantry combat vehicles, artillery systems, and other weapons that will make the backbone of this country's defense sufficiency, mind you, a minimum sufficiency. We favor dialogue to enable the Vienna agreements to be signed this year."

Arrives 24 Oct

PM2510131790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 90 Second Edition p 4

[Article by special correspondents A. Gorokhov and V. Peresada: "Toward Era of Peace and Cooperation"]

[Text] Brussels, 24 Oct—Army General M.A. Moiseyev, first deputy defense minister and chief of general staff of the Armed Forces of the USSR, arrived in the Belgian capital today. The visit is at the invitation of Lieutenant General J. Charlier, chief of General Stafaff of the Belgian Armed Forces, and General V. Eide, chairman of the NATO Military Committee.

At Melbruk [name as transliterated] air base, where a meeting ceremony took place, M.A. Moiseyev told PRAVDA correspondents:

"This visit which, incidentally, is the first at this level in the history of military contacts between the Soviet Union and Belgium and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries, is taking place under the conditions of a considerable warming of the political climate in Europe. It is moving from the era of confrontation and division toward an era of peace and cooperation. This trip became possible thanks to all this."

Meets Belgian Military Leader

LD2410224490 Moscow TASS in English 2201 GMT 24 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shashkov]

[Text] Brussels October 25 TASS—Soviet Deputy Defence Minister and Chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces Mikhail Moiseyev, who arrived in Belgium on a visit, on Wednesday [24 October] met Chief of the General Staff of the Belgian Armed Forces Joseph Charlier.

The two military leaders discussed the development of relations between the two countries' military men, the consequences of German unification and prospects for restructuring NATO and the Warsaw Pact in the light of changes occurring in Europe and the world.

On the same day, Moiseyev addressed students and faculty of the Belgian Higher Royal Institute for Defence, which plays an important role in elaborating military-strategic concepts.

He noted that opportunities for ensuring security by political means were being significantly increased in new conditions. The Soviet Union sees Europe without military blocs, without confrontation. The confrontation between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, as the legacy of the past, does not attune with the spirit of the times.

Moiseyev said that the Soviet military doctrine rejects wars as a means of settling disagreements between states. He emphasised that the doctrine is a guidance to action rather than a declaration of intent.

The USSR is drastically reducing its Armed Forces. The sweeping military reform is transforming the entire structure of the Armed Forces, applying a defensive nature to it. These measures are the practical steps towards creating the material base of the new model of security.

The NATO countries also adopted several positive decisions. The London declaration proclaimed a whole programme of actions, including redefining the military doctrine and strategy. It is important today that these statements be matched with deeds, especially in transforming the North Atlantic alliance.

Moiseyev emphasised the important role of contacts in the military field, which help build trust, relieve military tension and promote mutual understanding.

Meets NATO's Woerner; Gives Speech

LD2510172190 Moscow TASS in English 1641 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] Brussels October 25 TASS—Soviet First Deputy Defence Minister and Chief-of-Staff Mikhail Moiseyev continued his visit to Belgium today. He visited NATO's headquarters in Brussels to meet NATO Secretary-General Manfred Woerner and chairman of the NATO military committee Vigleik Eide.

They exchanged views on prospects for strengthening security in Europe and the changing role of military-political alliances under the impact of sharply reduced international tension.

Moiseyev then attended a session of the NATO military committee. Eide welcomed him and stressed that the first ever visit by a Soviet military commander testified to the depth of changes in the world.

In his address to NATO chiefs-of-staff Moiseyev noted that major changes had occurred in the European political climate over the past year. Relations between NATO and the Warsaw treaty organisation are now being built on a new basis, the expansion of East-West contacts in the military field contributed to strengthening the atmosphere of trust and cooperation.

Under these conditions, new opportunities offer themselves for ensuring security by political means while scaling down the general level of military confrontation.

He stressed that the Soviet Union favoured creating a new, European-scale security system and a unified Europe and promoting cooperation.

The Soviet Union is carrying out its military reform, building and training its Armed Forces along these lines.

Meets NATO's General Galvin

LD2610120790 Moscow TASS International Service in ssian 1052 GMT 26 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Simonenko]

[Text] Brussels, 26 Oct (TASS)—Army General M.A. Moiseyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, today visited the headquarters of the Supreme Command, Allied Powers Europe, which is situated in the south of the country.

He met with General J. Galvin, Supreme Allied Commander Europe, and also with headquarters ranking personnel.

Gorbachev Greets Austrians on National Day

LD2510205590 Moscow TASS in English 1810 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS—President Gorbachev has sent a telegram to Austrian Federal President Kurt Waldheim. It contains heartfelt congratulations and kind wishes to him and the Austrian nation on their national holiday—the 35th anniversary of the adoption of the Law on Permanent Neutrality.

"I hope that in the new Europe, the creation of which Austria is promoting in its specific way, friendly Soviet-Austrian relations will further develop", said the telegram, circulated here tonight.

Nordic Delegation Visits on Soviet Refugee Issue

PM1810102490 Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET in Swedish 16 Oct 90 p 3

[Article by Maria Romantschuk: "'Say "No" To a Wave of Immigrants From the East'"]

[Text] Moscow—What will the Nordic countries do if 5-6 million people suddenly start arriving from the Soviet Union?

That question was put by Ivan Laptev, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union, to the Nordic Council delegation during the group's first day in Moscow.

Laptev appealed to the Nordic countries to send signals that potential refugees from the Soviet Union are not welcome in the Nordic area. It must be made clear that there is neither the readiness to receive, nor any interest in receiving, a flood of refugees.

The delegation's week-long visit to the Soviet Union began in Moscow and will continue in the Baltic region.

[Finnish] Eduskunta deputy Mats Nyby (Social Democratic Party), who reported Laptev's remarks, said that people in the Soviet Union have the idea that they are welcome. Signals to the contrary are necessary, Laptev had said.

"His appeal made a strong impression on me," Nyby said. "And it ought to be food for thought for those people who are talking too enthusiastically about future open borders."

"This is a scenario that is being too little discussed in the Nordic area," Sweden's Karin Soder said. She predicted that in the next few years economic refugees will become an enormous problem.

"There are no green areas that would be available in the way they were when our forefathers made their way to America," Soder said. She stressed that we should give some general thought to what can be done with the people who try to flee poverty.

The delegation's Soviet hosts did not make any other direct appeals. They asked for help with technology and know-how to deal with their environmental problems, but did not ask for either money or food. Nevertheless all the Soviet figures with whom the Nordic parliamentarians met talked about the economic crisis and said that resolving it has the highest priority.

In addition to Ivan Laptev, the seven Nordic parliamentarians met with members of the Soviet parliament's committees on foreign affairs, the environment, the economy and social affairs, and culture.

"They have many huge problems to combat," said Pall Petursson, chairman of the Presidium of the Nordic Council, mentioning environmental problems as well as the economy.

The Nordic parliamentarians expressed their satisfaction with the openness shown by their Soviet hosts, who said unequivocally that they will not be able to sort out their other worries if they cannot resolve their fundamental economic problems.

"Today leading economists are like generals without an army," is how one economist at the Institute for European Studies put it.

"Nevertheless there seems to be great optimism about getting through the difficulties successfully," said Karin Soder, who also said that all the information given to the delegation had been given by way of explanation and not in the hope of help.

"Our hosts wanted us to gain a deeper understanding of the problems, and we are doing so," said [Finnish] Eduskunta deputy speaker Elsi Hetemaki-Olander.

Berit Oskarsson from Sweden said that in its intercourse with the Nordic countries the Soviet Union would like to give priority to training, but that here, too, money is an obstacle.

Today the delegation will meet Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. A planned meeting with Russian President Boris Yeltsin will not take place. In the evening the delegation will travel to the Lithuanian capital of Vilnius.

New Ambassador to Norway Appointed

LD2510182990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1008 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow, 25 Oct (TASS)—The president of the USSR has appointed Anatoliy Tishchenko as the USSR extraordinary and plenipotentiary ambassador to the Kingdom of Norway.

Until recently, Anatoliy Tishchenko was the first deputy chief of the Main Administration of Personnel and Educational Institutions of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The new ambassador has been appointed in connection with the death of Aleksandr Teterin, who occupied this position until June of this year.

Gas Pipeline Project With Greece Implemented

PM2410123990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Oct 90 Union Edition p 4

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Nikolayev: "Soviet Gas for Greece"]

[Text] Athens—Prime Minister K. Mitsotakis has stated that the Greek Government has decided to embark on the practical implementation of a project to supply natural gas to Greece from the Soviet Union.

The question of the possibility of the Soviet gas being carried across Bulgarian territory by pipeline was discussed back in the sixties, but for various reasons things never took off. Now, finally, the Soviet side has agreed to possible levels of delivery, schedules, and the terms of accounting. It is planned that in the first four years the Soviet Union will use a considerable amount (70-75 percent) of its foreign exchange earnings to pay for Greek goods and services (construction and shipbuilding).

The stumbling block, however, is the problem of financing construction of the gas pipeline. The Greek prime minister's statement mentioned for the first time that, thanks to help from the EEC, the money (1.3 billion Ecus) has been found. And, as K. Mitsotakis stated, this time he can guarantee that the main gas pipeline which will carry Soviet natural gas to Greece will be built in 1993.

Katushev-Led Delegation Stops in Cyprus

LD2310205990 Moscow TASS in English 2029 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] Nicosia October 23 TASS—A Soviet Government delegation led by Konstantin Katushev, minister for Foreign Economic Relations, en route to Saudi Arabia, made a stopover on Cyprus today. The delegation was welcomed by Cyprus Trade Minister Takis Nemitsas and other officials.

The two ministers discussed the forthcoming visit by President Georgios Vassliou of Cyprus to the Soviet Union next year.

The sides expressed readiness to develop trade and economic cooperation between the two states. Later in the day, the Soviet delegation departed for Riyadh.

Latin America & Caribbean

Argentine Leader Continues Visit

Meets Gorbachev 25 Oct

LD2510171590 Moscow TASS in English 1617 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and President Carlos Menem of Argentina had an important conversation, full of promise, in the Kremlin today.

"By setting the task of implementing perestroyka, you in the Soviet Union shook the foundations of the Old World. Your accomplishments in deepening freedom, which are responsible for the comprehensive development of democracy, deserve respect. Of course, it is more difficult to implement economic reform, but we know from our own experience that it is better to suffer once and create a solid base for well-being. You can count on Argentina to be your friend," President Menem said.

Argentina is now living through its own perestroyka, Menem continued. He described its main directions. Gorbachev wished success to the Argentine leaders and people during the implementation of the transformations.

The presidents exchanged views on the international situation. "Changes in the world are deep, and they continue to increase in scope," Gorbachev pointed out. "Humanity has taken to the path leading towards lasting peace. The turn in Soviet-American relations played an important part in it. Nothing could have happened without it. Now, however, we should move further. Now we should set in motion the process of spreading security throughout the world—to Latin America, Africa and, certainly, the Asian- Pacific region. The experience of Europe, which managed to overcome East-West rivalry, can play a positive role in the search for new solutions meeting the requirements of other regions. We are working towards this goal".

Carlos Menem pointed out that the disarmament process, which began recently, and the end of the "cold war" are changing the mentality of nations. "I do not agree with the division of the world into the First, Second and Third World. I support the ideas of new thinking: The world is an integral whole. Of course, people are different everywhere. They belong to different nationalities, religions, ideologies, but they are human beings all the same. The new world order, which is being established now, should serve people," the Argentine president said.

Gorbachev and Menem fully agree that the United Nations Organisation is now playing a great and ever growing role. For forty years it could not use its potential, Gorbachev pointed out. Now, however, it has been given an opportunity to do so. More and more elements of accord appear in the work of the U.N. This trend manifested itself in the unanimous denunciation of Iraq's aggressive actions. New thinking is being tested and is passing the test successfully.

They devoted special attention to the situation in Latin America. According to Menem, the situation on the continent is difficult, but the path it has chosen—that of democratisation and deepening the integration in economy—is the correct one. Gorbachev agreed that the continent is taking to a new path. "Our relations with Latin American countries are good, we highly appreciate them and intend to further develop them," he said.

The sides expressed their firm intention to expand and deepen comprehensive relations between the USSR and Argentina. Gorbachev and Menem agreed to continue contacts through personal meetings and other paths. They both described their dialogue as mutually beneficial.

Leaders Hold News Conference

PY2510234090 Buenos Aires NOTICIAS ARGENTINAS in Spanish 1650 GMT 25 Oct 90

[By NOTICIAS ARGENTINAS special correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, 25 Oct—Argentine President Carlos Menem said today that his Soviet counterpart, Mikhail Gorbachev, had congratulated him on sending warships to the Persian Gulf "to strengthen the UN embargo" of Iraq.

After a meeting between the two presidents at the Kremlin this morning, Menem said that Argentine Foreign Minister Domingo Cavallo "will immediately negotiate a line of credit with Germany to increase grain shipments to the Soviet Union."

Menem made these remarks in a news conference at the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Hall.

When asked about an article published in the U.S. newspaper WALL STREET JOURNAL, stating that Gorbachev and Menem are applauded abroad, but booed and hissed at in their own countries, Menem answered: "I do not agree. That is an invention by some reporters. I want to say to the reporter who wrote that article that he should refer to polls conducted in my country." He then declined to comment on happenings in the Soviet Union.

"Boos and hisses are an exception, and not something that happens all the time," Menem said. He added: "That lie cannot be repeated because in the end, people will end up believing it is true."

When he was asked about the scope of the talks with the Soviet leader, Menem said the meeting "lasted almost two hours, and we talked about the following issues: The situation of the East European countries, the new continental integration, the new UN role in solving conflicts, Gorbachev's proposal for changing the course of the Soviet economy, ecology, disarmament, and denuclearization, and in addition the preservation of nature."

In the case of the latter, the Argentine president reaffirmed his usual statement that "man destroys more than the worst wars." He added that during his conversation with Gorbachev, they also discussed the issue of international drug trafficking and the important role played by the United Nations.

Menem explained that so far "there is no set date" for a possible visit by Gorbachev to Argentina "because domestic problems take all of his time." He added, however, that a visit by Gorbachev to Buenos Aires "will probably take place next year."

He said that today he invited Gorbachev to visit Argentina, which, "according to everyone, is a country at the edge of the world." He also extended an invitation "to visit Ushuaia, the southernmost and most beautiful town in the world."

When asked about whether they discussed the conflict in the Persian Gulf, in the wake of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, Menem said: "Gorbachev congratulated Argentina on sending ships to that zone to strengthen the embargo" of the country led by Saddam Husayn.

"This is the first time the United Nations has reacted and provoked revolutionary events. Now, that organization is respected by all," Menem said, and added that personally, "as an Argentine and as president," he feels "more secure than before."

The Argentine president also said: "We are now walking toward a new world order to offset the failures of the different countries. We are walking toward a new legal and social order. There is only one world, only one integrated community."

When asked about the provision of grain to the Soviet Union, Menem recalled: "There is a $1.4-billion trade balance with this country;" I have no doubts that the agreement that expires in December will be renewed.

He added that Foreign Minister Domingo Cavallo "will leave for Germany tomorrow to negotiate a line of credit for Argentina, in order to continue supplying grain to the Soviet Union."

When asked whether he considered "paradoxical" the fact that hunger exists in Latin America, while Argentina seeks credits to ship grain to the Soviet Union, Menem answered: "There is hunger all over the world. The important thing is to circulate capital around the world. I refuse to be called underdeveloped and to speak of the Third World."

On the economic sector, President Menem made a point of saying: "Argentina has been very badly administered," and he repeated: "If the necessary guarantees are given, investments will come in because capital goes wherever there is security and where profits are made."

When asked whether there is agreement between what he discussed with Pope John Paul II a few days ago and what he discussed with Gorbachev today, he said: "Obviously," this time "we did not talk about religious matters."

Sign Joint Declaration

PY2610022290 Buenos Aires TELAM in Spanish 2045 GMT 25 Oct 90

[By TELAM special correspondent; quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow, 25 Oct (TELAM)—After meeting for one hour and 45 minutes, Argentine President Carlos Menem and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev went to an adjoining room in the Kremlin where they signed a joint declaration.

Afterward, Foreign Ministers Domingo Cavallo and Eduard Shevardnadze signed three important agreements. The meeting ended with a toast; then they attended a luncheon hosted by the Soviet president for his Argentine counterpart.

During a break, Foreign Minister Cavallo said he spent 90 minutes with Shevardnadze and they reached accord on bilateral agreements on guaranteeing investments and submitting disagreements to international courts; through these agreements entrepreneurial relations between the two countries can be enhanced.

The joint declaration, which was released at noon today in the Kremlin and was signed by Presidents Menem and Gorbachev in the presence of high-ranking officials, largely repeats the topics on which the two heads of state agreed during their talks.

The declaration states: "The presidents reviewed various aspects of the current international situation and development of the political and economic processes that are taking place both in the Argentine Republic and the Soviet Union.

The presidents also expressed their satisfaction with the atmosphere of understanding prevailing in their bilateral relations, as well as their mutual willingness to enhance these relations in every respect.

The presidents repeated in the declaration their concurrent concepts on the aim of supporting a strengthening of the United Nations in order for the latter to become involved in seeking peace and economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian cooperation.

In the political field, the declaration reiterates a "respect for the right of other peoples to choose their own political and socioeconomic development on the basis of strict compliance with international laws."

In addition, the declaration notes: "The exclusion of threats or force or their use in international relations as well as a willingness to guarantee one's own security to the detriment of other states.

The declaration includes a reference to the Malvinas [Falkland Islands]. In a very significant paragraph, it states: "The Soviet Union expresses its satisfaction over the resumption of diplomatic relations between the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, considering that the process of normalization and the resumption of dialogue between these nations will contribute to the reopening of negotiations that will lead to a peaceful solution to the controversy on the Malvinas issue in accordance with pertinent UN resolutions."

The presidents condemned "a policy based on nuclear intimidation, which is immoral and incompatible with the ideals of the civilized world."

After discussing the process of denuclearization in Europe, the presidents noted: "The arms race represents an obstacle to improvement of the atmosphere of international understanding, settlement of existing regional controversies, and prevention of potential conflicts."

The two heads of state emphasized: "The reduction of military expenditures as well as control of the illegal arms trade and acceleration of the process of converting military industry into peace industry is necessary."

The two heads of state also emphasized: "Latin America's positive political situation." In this respect, they talked about democracy, institutional stability, and regional consultation mechanisms.

The heads of state expressed their approval of "confirmation of the dynamic force of the Latin American integration process, particularly the Southern Cone common market." They expressed their conviction that "the accelerated regional integration process can be effectively completed with inter-regional cooperation."

In the economic field, the presidents noted: "The positive step represented by the change in the state's role in the economy in order to take into account market possibilities and the people's social protection."

"It is imperative to draw up a program that will provide a final solution to the foreign debt crisis, taking into account the various levels of development of the states involved in this situation."

In the legal field, the presidents agreed "to create a legal and institutional basis favorable for the development of trade and the promotion of investments and joint ventures—even in third countries—using public or private capital to undertake projects in areas such as machinery concessions, urban development, transportation, communications, energy, food industry, petroleum production, and mining and fishing industry, among others."

In specific terms, the presidents expressed their desire to contribute to promoting bilateral trade by searching for new ways of cooperation and expanding their areas of trade.

Touching on cultural and humanitarian topics, they expressed "their decision to guarantee human rights and all internationally recognized fundamental liberties within their territories."

They agreed to conduct "close, energetic cooperation" on the subject of international terrorism and the drug trade.

Menem Leaves for Leningrad

LD2510205190 Moscow TASS in English 1857 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS—President Carlos Menem of Argentina left Today for Leningrad, the Soviet Union's second largest industrial and cultural center. At the airport, decked with the national flags of Argentina and the USSR, he was seen off by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze.

New Ambassador to Chile Views Latin America

91UF0066A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Oct 90 Union Edition p 5

[Report on interview with Yu.I. Pavlov, USSR ambassador to Chile, by Yevgeniy Bay; place and date not given: "The Ambassador in Santiago"]

[Text] *By an edict of the president of the USSR, Yuriy Ivanovich Pavlov, who was previously chief of the Latin American Countries Administration of the USSR Foreign Ministry, has been appointed USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary in the Republic of Chile. Foreign news media have noted Yu.I. Pavlov's role in our diplomatic activity regarding Latin America, emphasizing his flexible and balanced approach to the problems of this continent. We hope that the Soviet ambassador will also continue this policy in Santiago.*

[Bay] Yuriy Ivanovich, your first steps in the Chilean capital....

[Pavlov] Will begin with the establishment of the necessary official and political contacts and familiarization with this most interesting Latin American country. After all, I have not previously been to Chile. There is now perestroyka there also—democratic institutions have been restored, the country is being led by a president elected by the people in free elections and political parties and the parliament have resumed normal activity. The democratization process is not being accompanied by a destabilization of the domestic political atmosphere and a deterioration in the economic situation. There are things that we can learn from the Chileans.

Of course, the initial period of an embassy's activity is inevitably also connected with the solution of purely internal organizational and economic problems. I have to say, however, that our difficulties in Santiago cannot be compared with the adversities which the Chilean Embassy in Moscow, which began functioning this June,

is having to endure. It is still housed in the Kosmos Hotel, which is several times more expensive than the most fashionable hotels in other world capitals, although inferior to them in the same measure in terms of comfort.

I will take this opportunity to once again—publicly this time—most urgently request that the Moscow City Soviet help the USSR Foreign Ministry resolve the problem of locating the Chilean Embassy in Moscow. Granted all our difficulties, I cannot believe that it is insoluble. It is our duty as a state to ensure normal conditions for the work of foreign embassies.

[Bay] Seventeen years without official contacts is a long time. Does it seem to you now, this time having elapsed, that our departure from Chile in 1973 was inevitable? Might we, perhaps, have adopted a different position at that time?

[Pavlov] By the standards of those times such a step was justified. We could not have remained after what happened during the putsch and for several days following it. This was what both the Soviet public and the Chilean democratic parties, which were being routed, believed. On the other hand, there were instances in our diplomatic practice in the 1970's when the military took power in one Latin American country or another, accompanied by an intensification of repressive measures no less and even greater, perhaps, than in Chile, but relations with the Soviet Union were maintained.

[Bay] As in Argentina, for example?

[Pavlov] Yes, relations with this country were not broken off, although during the rule of the military they remained formal.

[Bay] Which did not prevent us from actively trading with Argentina, purchasing grain and meat from it....

[Pavlov] I am talking now about political cooperation with one regime or another. Of course, from a long-term point of view it is simpler, if relations are maintained, to resume this cooperation when a democratic government assumes office. And it would be easier for us now in Santiago. This is, obviously, applicable to other instances also, Israel, for example. While having maintained normal relations with Tel Aviv, Western countries have been able to establish pretty good contacts with the Arab world also. But I repeat, in that period both our public and the Chilean public could have seen a decision to remain as a kind of treachery.

[Bay] Did we have any contacts during this time with the Pinochet government?

[Pavlov] Yes, but only at the working, nongoverment level. For example, in 1981-1982 I twice headed our delegations to conferences of the international commission for the preservation of vital marine resources in the Antarctic. There were commercial relations also, albeit through third countries. Chile purchased from us, specifically, Lada passenger automobiles through Panama.

[Bay] What now are the prospects which are opening up for possible foreign economic relations with Chile? What can this country offer us?

[Pavlov] It is more a question of what we can offer. Chile is one of the few economically prosperous countries in Latin America. Which, unfortunately, cannot be said about our country's position in Europe. In principle Chile is a promising market for our automobiles and industrial equipment. But this is a highly competitive market. There are other difficulties also. It is not usual in Chile for the state to provide guarantees for commercial deals, but our foreign trade organizations are not accustomed to operating without such guarantees. It will evidently be necessary to take an intelligent risk if we wish to trade with this country.

We are interested in resuming cooperation with Chile in the sphere of fishing. A Soviet-Chilean fishing agreement which was concluded formerly was terminated, but there is an agreement to negotiate the conclusion of a new agreement. A highly positive step was the signing this June of an intergovernmental agreement on air traffic. As distinct from such agreements with other South American countries, in which the traffic is all one way, reciprocity is stipulated: airliners of Lan-Chile—the first airline company of South America to acquire the possibility of using Sheremetyevo Airport—will fly to us.

[Bay] How do you conceive of relations with the new Chilean Government and the leadership of the Christian Democratic Party?

[Pavlov] The spectrum of political forces which has assumed office in this country is very wide. The leading role is being performed by the Christian Democrats, but in the coalition which won the elections there are Socialists as well, and it is also supported by the communists. All the political parties which took part in the elections approve of the idea of restoring diplomatic relations with the USSR. This coincides with our present approach, when we aspire to maintain normal relations with all states.

[Bay] At the time of the Popular Unity Government of the left the communists laid claim to special status in relations with the Soviet Union. What will be our relations with the Communist Party, which is in serious crisis, now?

[Pavlov] For us, as a whole, there has been a change in our approach to contacts with various political parties in foreign countries. Whereas previously the CPSU maintained relations only with the communist parties and, in rare instances, with social democratic parties, and then only those of a left persuasion, we now aspire to establish relations with all influential political parties of a democratic orientation which are opposed to forcible methods of winning power. The Communist Party of Chile is included among these also. We do not support the activity of terrorist organizations and will not establish contacts with such organizations.

[Bay] We have moved beyond the framework of purely Chilean subjects, and I would like to take advantage of this. What kind of contacts are we maintaining with El Salvador's insurgents, who, as is known, support violent methods of struggle also?

[Pavlov] At present we maintain contacts both with the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front [FMLN] and the Salvador Government, primarily for the purpose of assisting a peaceful settlement of the conflict in this country. Ten years ago, when the insurgent struggle in El Salvador began, there was there an out-and-out dictatorship of forces of the extreme right, and horrifying violations of human rights occurred. The opposition was unable at that time to conduct a struggle by political means. In recent years the situation in El Salvador has changed markedly. The implementation of agrarian reform has begun, and agricultural cooperatives have come to be formed. Presidential and parliamentary elections are being held. However, problems of the peasants' hunger for land and the poverty of broad strata of the country's populace have yet to be solved, despite these reforms and despite the multimillion-dollar assistance of the United States; and far more radical democratic transformations, on which the FMLN, which is currently negotiating with the Cristiani government, is insisting, are required there. Nor has the problem of a halt to the activity of the "death squads" and the disbanding of the armed formations which are linked to them been resolved. Nonetheless, the conditions have begun to take shape in the country for legal activity not only by the center but also by left political forces. Such well-known progressive figures as Guillermo Ungo and Ruben Zamora have been able to return to El Salvador.

Much will now depend on whether the parties to the Salvadoran conflict succeed in agreeing on the terms for a cease-fire so that the parliamentary elections scheduled for March 1991 can be conducted under international supervision under peaceful conditions and that candidates representing the interests of the armed opposition may take part in them also.

[Bay] We can hardly support economic sabotage, in which the front is engaged—blowing up bridges, roads and power lines—either. I have been in El Salvador and have seen how these methods are rejected by the people.

[Pavlov] Of course, Salvadorans are tired of the war and the operations of both sides. Methods of economic sabotage are not the most humane method of waging war. But the government forces are also acting heedlessly, shelling and bombing densely populated areas.

[Bay] Will the nature and the extent of our economic assistance to Nicaragua change?

[Pavlov] They have already changed, but not because the opposition has come to power in this country. We now cooperate with developing countries with regard for the actual possibilities of our economy and are switching, where possible, to a basis of mutual advantage. Practice shows that assistance granted free of charge and without any conditions does not, as a rule, produce any big results. I say this not because we agree with all the conditions which the IMF puts forward before granting credit. But a country rendering assistance has a right to know how it will be used. If the allocated resources are spent inefficiently, this is simply amoral and dishonest in respect of our people inasmuch as we are taking away from ourselves what we ourselves need.

[Bay] This applies, evidently, to our relations with Cuba also. The situation where Cuba was selling on the world market Soviet oil which had been supplied in amounts in excess of its normal requirements could hardly have been considered normal.

[Pavlov] What was, was. Truly, there was such a form of assistance. But the situation has changed, and the Cuban comrades understand this. Our desire notwithstanding, we will simply not have the opportunity to render assistance on the former scale and in the same form as before. The Cuban leaders have already warned the country's population about this. We now have to make serious changes in Soviet-Cuban economic cooperation, but to do so with the least possible detriment to both our economy and the Cuban economy.

[Bay] Even just a few years ago even it was hard to imagine that Soviet people could be meeting in Miami with Cuban emigre leaders, but this is now a real fact. How do you evaluate this meeting?

The meeting was not, I would like to make clear right away, with leaders of the Cuban community. A Soviet-American conference on cooperation between the USSR and United States in various fields was held last summer in Miami, and certain Cuban emigre leaders took part. They took part as American citizens, and we had talks with them as such. On the eve of the meeting the American magazine U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT and subsequently the Spanish EFE news agency disseminated a report that the Russians had allegedly taken good note of the lessons of East Europe and wanted to establish contacts with the people who could come to power on Cuba. We refuted this version, naturally.

[Bay] But we should not, perhaps, be so afraid of Havana's possible reaction to such contacts. We have spent too much time in the channel of Cuban policy, which has not always and in all things been in keeping with our interests.

[Pavlov] There is one point of principle. We do not intend to make contact with organizations pursuing the goal of the violent ouster of a government with which we maintain normal, and in this case friendly, relations. True, the leaders of the Cuban community in Miami assured us that they no longer have such a goal. We, for our part, called their attention to the senselessness of their formulating the question of the Soviet Union terminating economic assistance to Cuba, given the continuation of the American economic blockade. After all, the need for such assistance arose precisely because

of the blockade, which is supported by Cuban emigres in the United States. Lift the blockade, and Cuba will not need our assistance.

[Bay] Speaking about the Moscow-Washington-Havana triangle, what can our country do to normalize the situation? What kind of steps might we take to establish cooperation with the United States in Latin America as a whole?

[Pavlov] We are prepared to contribute in every way possible to the normalization of Cuban-American relations. Our presence on Cuba does not have an anti-American focus. Military cooperation with Cuba began when a real threat to its security had arisen. In the absence of this threat, there would be no need for our military assistance either. We recall that when the United States stopped giving the Contras military assistance, the threat to Nicaraguan security diminished, and we reached agreement with the Sandinistas on a halt to arms supplies to this country.

It is important that there has been a change in the Americans' own attitude toward our presence in Latin America. Earlier, during the cold war, practically any step on our part to strengthen the USSR's influence in Latin America was automatically seen in the United States as being directed against their interests. Washington now understands that we are not endeavoring to fish in troubled waters and are not interested in destabilizing existing regimes but are, on the contrary, ready to establish relations with all governments of Latin American countries, regardless of their political coloration. We have concluded that it would be better were each of us to involve ourselves with our own problems and not intensify someone else's.

We need to switch from confrontation to cooperation. This contributed to the peace settlement in Nicaragua, and I hope it will facilitate a halt to the armed conflict in El Salvador. Even now we have far greater trust in one another and less reason to expect dirty tricks in respect of ourselves and our friends.[end interview]

From IZVESTIYA files: The history of our relations with Chile has been quite complex. Diplomatic relations were established in 1944 and were broken off in 1947 on the initiative of the Chilean side. Relations were resumed in 1964 and they lasted until 22 September 1973. Thus relations between Moscow and Santiago since the war have been maintained for only 12 years.

Supreme Soviet

Decision Published on Revolution Anniversary

PM2610132590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 90 Second Edition p 1

["USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution on Celebrating the 73d Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] "The Soviet people have always marked the anniversary of the Great October as the birthday of the Soviet State and as a prominent hallmark in the revolutionary renewal of the world. Taking into account numerous appeals from citizens, letters and telegrams from public organizations and labor collectives in connection with the celebration of the anniversary of the October, the USSR Supreme Soviet has decreed:

On behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet to hold a ceremonial meeting dedicated to the 73d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution [GOSR] at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 6 November. To envisage that members of the USSR Supreme Soviet, people's deputies, representatives of public organizations, labor collectives of Moscow and Moscow oblast, and servicemen of the Moscow Garrison are invited to the ceremonial meeting. To place responsibility upon the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium for staging necessary events connected with the preparation and the holding of the ceremonial meeting dedicated to the 73d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The USSR Supreme Soviet expresses confidence that the supreme soviets of the Union and autonomous republics, and local soviets of people's deputies will ensure that the country's main state holiday—with ceremonial meetings, marches, rallies, street festivies, and demonstrations—is staged under the sign of the consolidation and the comprehensive renewal of our society and loyalty to the ideals of the Great October."

[Signed] USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Lukyanov
Kremlin, Moscow, 23 October 1990

Committee Discusses Policies on Women's Issues

LD2510212890 Moscow TASS in English 1920 GMT 25 Oct 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS—The first decree Mikhail Gorbachev issued upon his election president was aimed at improving the situation of women, at protecting mothers and children, as was stated today during hearings in Soviet parliament conducted by the parliamentary Committee for Women's Affairs and other committees and commissions.

What is the real situation of women in society at present? When Nikita Khrushchev was asked by a French correspondent why so many women in the Soviet Union are engaged in strenuous work, he answered: True, they work hard, but unlike many French women, they do not have to walk streets to earn their living.

Many things have changed in the Soviet Union since that time. Soviet women have always had a reputation for beauty. Now they dress better and are better groomed. But to this day foreign guests arriving in the USSR are amazed at the sight of women clad in formless orange jackets, equipped with spades and crowbars, busy repairing roads. There are also prostitutes in our country. It must be admitted that both evils have an economic basis, and that the situation can change for the better only if the country's economy improves.

Speakers at today's hearings noted that the situation had not improved, although the Soviet Union had adopted more than once "the most progressive laws in the world" to improve women's position in society. Vladimir Shcherbakov, chairman of the USSR State committee for Labour, who spoke on behalf of the Council of Ministers, said that good intentions quite often produced the opposite results. Various benefits and pay bonuses often atract women to strenuous work, although a policy barring women from such occupations should be implemented. This is necessary in order to protect the health of women and children.

Shcherbakov announced the government's intention to review the state policy with regard to women. The document includes a comprehensive programme to resolve economic, legal, health and labour problems. Within a month or two it will be ready to be submitted to parliament.

The hearings mark an end to the United Nations Decade of Women.

Political & Social

Moscow General Details 7 November Parade Plans

LD2510174890 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS—A total of 8,643 soldiers will take part in the military parade on November 7 on Red Square to mark the 73rd anniversary of the socialist revolution, a senior military officer told the newspaper IZVESTIYA today. This is 657 less people than in previous years.

Lieutenant General Anatoliy Golovnev, deputy commander of the Moscow Military District, told the newspaper that motorised rifle units, Airborne Troops, tankmen, marines, and cadets in military academies and military schools will take part in the parade.

The general stressed that "marching in one rank will be Lithuanians and Ukrainians, Russians and Georgians". No new combat hardware will be displayed except for the "Topol" (Poplar) rocket launcher, which will be on show for the first time.

Commenting on the fact that some cities had refused to stage parades, Golovnev said:

"I can't understand the desire of certain people to forget their past. This is nothing more than arrogance on the part of new local authorities. I can see another thing in this—it is easier to engage in demagogy than to organise economic life on the periphery. The Army had to step in to save the harvest. The Moscow Military District alone dispatched 35,000 people to bring in the harvest. On some days, as many as 75,000 soldiers were out in the fields."

New Trade Union Organization Established

LD2610122190 Moscow TASS in English 1202 GMT 26 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondents Igor Agabekov, Leonid Vorontsov, and Vladimir Yeregov]

[Text] Moscow October 26 TASS—Soviet trade unions, gathered for a congress in the Kremlin, formed a new national body today in order to consolidate forces and coordinate trade union activities to protect the rights of Soviet citizens.

The new body, the General Confederation of Soviet Trade Unions, will be independent from state, political and public structures, the declaration passed by the 19th congress reads.

National, regional and industrial trade union amalgamations are free to join the confederation and will retain organisational and financial independence in accordance with their rules and programmes.

The congress abolished the old ruling trade union body—the Central Council of Trade Unions—on Thursday, saying it had exhausted itself and was hampering the movement's initiative and independence.

The former union was unable to protect workers' interests during market reforms, speakers at the congress said.

The decision to form the new confederation was supported by an overwhelming majority of the 2,088 delegates.

The congress, which is expected to end on Saturday, has yet to adopt the confederation's structure and policy or elect the leadership.

Ryzhkov Meets Congress Delegates

LD2510205890 Moscow TASS in English 1913 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov today met delegates to the 19th Trade Union Congress, who represent various branches of the agro-industrial complex and regions of the country.

They discussed topical issues of production and social life in the village, as well as measures to shift the agrarian sector to market relations.

Ryzhkov thanked the delegates for their constructive attitude towards the government's strategy for developing the agro-industrial complex and, primarily, the social sphere in the village.

He stressed that in all these issues the government counts on mutual understanding and close cooperation with the Federation of Trade Unions of Agro-Industrial Complexes.

Working Groups Hold Meetings

LD2510214390 Moscow TASS in English 1746 GMT 25 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondents Leonid Vorontsov and Vladimir Yegorov]

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS—Delegates to the 19th congress of Soviet trade unions today continued work in groups. Representatives of the largest organisation of the country's working people, which unites more than 140 million people, discussed the unity of the trade union movement, efforts to protect the working people's socio-economic rights in a market economy and the relationship between trade unions and the working class movement in the USSR in conditions of political pluralism.

Delegates considered the trade unions' role in enhancing labour safety and environmental protection, solving housing and every-day problems, health care and social insurance management.

A separate group dealt with trade union aid to those who suffered as a result of the Chernobyl accident. Discussions were held on the trade unions' role in protecting the Soviet people's cultural interests. Delegates also focused on various aspects of trade unions' work to protect the law in present-day conditions.

Discussions in all ten working groups were stormy but useful. The congress will have the final say. It should specify the nature of the new trade union centre and prioritise some areas in its activity as the federation renews itself and moves towards a market economy.

The congress will continue proceedings in the Kremlin on Friday.

Miners' Congress Discusses Market Economy, Pay

LD2510203590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] The congress of the country's miners continued in Donetsk today. The main question discussed was that of how the coal industry will operate under the market economy. Mikhail Ivanovich Shchadov, the coal industry minister, delivered a very extensive report. The congress was also addressed by Lev Dmitriyevich

Ryabev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who together with miners' representatives heads the commission which is supervising the government's implementation of miners' demands.

Assessing the report delivered by Mikhail Ivanovich [Shchadov]—he called it a program—for the coal industry's switch to the market economy, the miners consider that, generally speaking, there is no such program. All they heard was that next year subsidies will have to be doubled. In other words, the country's miners expect R23 billion from the state. The minister urged the congress to record in its resolution that it demands this from the state. Half the country's mines have not been reconstructed or modernized for 30 years. It will be very difficult for the miners to enter into a market economy. This is probably why they are trying to create a new union, one which will defend their interests in the new conditions.

Among other things, the draft of the general agreement which the new trade union is to conclude the Union government, the governments of the republics, and with the employers, cites a specific figure for miners' pay, pay which miners should receive in the conditions of a market economy. This figure is R2,000. This is the level of pay the new trade union will seek from employers.

The debate over the question of the transition to a market economy is very stormy. Tomorrow is the last day of the congress. This is when all the important decisions on the agenda, and on the creation of a new, independent trade union are to be made. The congress will also adopt a general resolution and a specific resolution on the switch to a market economy.

Reporter Denied Entry to Congress

PM2610103390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Correspondent B. Glotov report: "Magic 'Mark'"]

[Text] Donetsk—An unpleasant surprise awaited me at the news conference held by the organizing committee of the second miners' congress: Your PRAVDA correspondent proved to be persona non grata at the congress—they had not issued me an invitation. The same fate was in store for some other journalists.

"Why is this?" I asked the registration girl.

"Your name has not been checked off by Comrade Makarov."

"What do you expect, do you remember how PRAVDA reported the miners' previous congress," the same "Comrade Makarov," a member of the "Donetskugol" association's strike committee, retorted.

Clearly, some people did not like the way certain newspapers covered the first congress and thus decided to "grade" journalists by giving passes only to those who suited them.

Incidentally, this is not the only irritating feature. The press conference was chaotic and disorganized.

Nevertheless, passes were issued to your PRAVDA correspondent and the other journalists not favored with the "mark" of approval.

The following day we went with everyone else into the hall where delegates spent the whole day electing the congress' working organs and approving the agenda. A committee to work on citizens' statements to the congress was also set up.

Delegates dedicated day two of the congress to a discussion of reports on the fulfillment of the first miners' congress decisions and on the creation of their own independent union.

Kiev District Commander on Military Coup Rumors

PM2410150090 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 41, 21-28 Oct 90 p 6

[Letter from Kiev Military District Commander Colonel General Boris Gromov and response from MOSCOW NEWS editors: "Don't Stir Up Trouble"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] MN [MOSCOW NEWS] (Sept. 23, 1990) featured a round-table discussion chaired by the well-known political writer Andrey Nuykin and entitled "Military Coup in the USSR?" Among those who sent in their comments was Colonel-General Boris Gromov, commander of the Kiev Military District. Here's what he wrote.

Rumours of a coup d'etat are spreading. Perhaps one of the many reasons is society's wish to end the growing anarchy and chaos.

That the coup is necessarily seen as military has different implications, to my mind. Some people would dearly like to see continued confrontation between the army and society. The MN article of Sept. 23 echoes this wish.

But the confrontation topic is different this time around. The army was first attacked for being "immoral" some time ago. All mention of the moral aspects of army service vanished from our press. Next came a wave of charges over the military overspending and the resulting economic difficulties. Now it has been found that our economy was fatally sick long before this and that the army is not to blame.

A new charge had to be found. It has been found: the army is preparing a coup so as to "bash the perestroika men's heads together". Sounds topical and certainly arouses interest, the indiscriminating reader may even like it. Most importantly - no responsibility at all; in the words of the man who wrote the article, it was written "just in case".

I don't want to discuss the pros and cons of the article. The reader can do that independently. But one cannot

fail to see that Andrey Nuykin and the other participants in the MN discussion on whose behalf he wrote forgot tact and journalistic ethics in their attempt to achieve maximum emotional impact.

The article is full of morsels to whet the readers' appetite. It has "generals savaging perestroika", whose words are on a par with the non-convertible Soviet kopek, advocates of democracy and radical reform within the army who are all kept under supervision with informers in each platoon and section, and a cruel purging of democratic elements among the officers disguised as personnel cuts. I could go on, but even this is enough to give you the creeps.

Why did they write this? In order to disguise their incompetence perhaps. It is clear that participants in the debate have little understanding of their subject matter. One can see that by reading about the military coup described by the Nuykin-Urazhtsev duo. The discussion is not helped by the participation of the military. Hard to say why. They have either been absent from the troops and the processes occurring within the army too long, or else this is because of the "sand" washed into Moscow during the perestroika years (A. Nuykin's expression).

What is described in the article may just be isolated facts. There is no reason to say this is happening in the army as a whole.

Nuykin-Urazhtsev's coup account evokes smiles and sympathy, not surprise and indignation. Sympathy because of their naivety and their attempts to make conclusions about things they don't understand.

I can state quite definitely that what the army is now busy with is not the problem of a military coup. We see our main task as the maintenance of security in conditions of growing chaos. This is not simple to do, partly due to irresponsible publications.

The generals criticized by Nuykin are no less interested in perestroika than he. Candidates "for the role of military dictator" mentioned in the article are not hatching plans of a military coup. Notably, Nuykin reveals an uncanny ability: he can discuss someone's part in a coup and his ideas without being acquainted with that person and despite the huge distances between Moscow and other cities.

Not venturing to predict future developments, I believe in the triumph of common sense. I also believe that we shall emerge from this severe test without a coup. For that there should be less emotions, less invention and manipulation of passions and malice.

It's high time our political writers and journalists stopped working towards confrontation between different state and social structures.

Let's turn our talents (including literary talents) to the consolidation of our forces, to help ensure that the process of change is successful. If a coup is constantly discussed, the natural question is: "does someone really need a coup?"

[Signed] Boris Gromov

From the editors

Our readers perhaps feel gratified because such a well-known military chief as Colonel-General Gromov gives authoritative assurances that there is no threat of a military coup.

Out of respect for the views of our opponents we publish the letter from the commander of the Kiev Military District in full. We agree with his conclusion about the need to stop "working towards confrontation between different state and social structures".

Regretfully, Boris Gromov's call is only addressed to journalists. But don't the rather hasty words from top men in the army like General Makashov, who addressed the founding congress of the Russian Communist Party, add fuel to the flames of public debate? Can one expect society to be indifferent towards the army being used against fellow citizens, instead of against enemies outside the country?

The embittered and sometimes fierce debate between the army and civilian society did not start in a vacuum. We are convinced that it will end quickly and fruitfully if the military sheds the delusion that "civilians" are incompetent panic mongers and overcompetent troublemakers.

Kryuchkov, Others Discuss Crime Prevention

PM2410201490 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Oct 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by F. Ivanov: "How To Ensure Citizens' Safety"]

[Text] A news conference at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center on 22 October focused on questions of strengthening law and order and improving citizens' safety.

It was attended by V. Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR KGB; V. Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs; V. Yakovlev, USSR minister of justice; A. Vasilyev, USSR deputy general prosecutor; and A. Filatov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Court.

All the news conference participants admitted that the problem of increased crime remains the main thorn in society's side. Serious measures have not yet been devised to reduce crime and the number of unsolved cases is increasing. This despite the fact that the country's government and the soviets have been increasingly active of late in strengthening internal affairs organs and improving their facilities and have been investing rather a lot of money in them—so far it has not produced the goods. V. Bakatin believes the time has come to create a

national program to fight crime, to which the best scientific forces, including academic institutes, would contribute.

In Justice Minister V. Yakovlev's opinion, there exists a special problem that in conditions of the growth of centrifugal forces many republics and even oblasts are creating laws that contradict all-Union laws. This "parade of sovereignties," as V. Yakovlev called it, is bound to give rise to legal nihilism and indirectly assists criminal elements, who are quick to take advantage of the "time of troubles." Nonetheless, V. Bakatin believes, these realities have to be faced. For that very reason, the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry, now that the USSR President's Decree on the Surrender of Weapons has expired, has proposed the creation of the republics' own militarized formations, which will meet their internal needs. What we are talking about, in effect, is deeming constitutional the laws a number of republics have already adopted on their own internal forces.

The news conference participants devoted a great deal of attention to the functioning of law-enforcement organs in market economy conditions. According to V. Yakovlev, drastic changes have to be made to legislation, in particular changes affecting financial and economic law. Of course, the transition from administrative command management to legislatively regulated economic relations will take rather a long time. One must not forget, of course, that only a full-fledged market can defeat the shadow economy. But it is important that at the initial stage of the transition to the market, money obtained by unfair means should not be involved in privatization.

The time has come, however, to take a different view of many actions that used to be considered illegal. V. Bakatin announced that the USSR Supreme Soviet is currently examining a draft law on intensifying the struggle against speculation. However, the draft totally alters the substance of the concept of speculation, making it possible to legalize the activities of the middleman.

USSR KGB Chairman V. Kryuchkov talked about the work being done to rehabilitate citizens convicted of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda in the sixties and seventies under Articles 70 and 190 of the Criminal Code. The KGB chairman believes that the majority of them will be exonerated after all the cases have been carefully examined.

PRAVDA Publishes Law on Public Associations

91US0031B Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Oct 90 Second Edition p 3

["USSR Law: On Public Associations"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The right to association is an inalienable right of man and citizen proclaimed by the General Declaration on Human Rights and enshrined in the USSR Constitution and constitutions of the Union and autonomous republics. The Soviet state, which is interested in the development of the creative initiative and social and political assertiveness of the citizens and their participation in the control of government and society, guarantees citizens of the USSR the freedom to create public associations.

SECTION 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 1. **Concept of the public association**

The public association is a voluntary formation which has emerged as a result of the free expression of the will of citizens who have united on the basis of a community of interests.

Political parties, mass movements, trade unions, women's and veterans organizations, invalid organizations, youth and children's organizations, scientific, technical, physical culture and sports, and other voluntary societies, artistic unions, groups of fellow countrymen, foundations, associations, and other bodies of citizens are recognized as public associations.

This law does not extend to cooperative and other organizations pursuing commercial ends or contributing to the extraction of profit (income) by other enterprises and organizations, organs of territorial public self-government (neighborhood councils and committees, house, street, block, community, and village committees, and others) and organs of public amateur activity (neighborhood watches, comrades' courts, and others) whose procedure of creation and activity is determined by other legislation.

Article 2. **Legislation governing public associations**

Legislation governing public associations consists of this law determining the fundamentals of the legal position of public associations, other laws of the USSR, laws of the Union and autonomous republics, and other instruments of legislation.

Article 3. **Purposes of the creation and activity of public associations**

Public associations are created for the purpose of the realization and protection of civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights and liberties; development of the assertiveness and amateur activity of the citizens and their participation in the control of state and public affairs; satisfaction of professional and amateur interests; development of scientific, technical, and artistic creativity; protection of the health of the population and participation in charitable activity; cultural-educational, physical cultural-recuperative and sports activity; protection of nature and historical and cultural monuments; patriotic and humanitarian education; broadening of international relations and a strengthening of peace and friendship between peoples; exercise of other activity not prohibited by law.

The creation and activity of public associations whose purpose or modus operandi is the ousting of or a forcible

change in the constitutional system or the forcible rupture of the unity of the territory of the USSR, the Union and autonomous republics, and the autonomous formations, propaganda of war, violence, and brutality, the incitement of class and also racial, national, and religious discord, and the perpetration of other crimes punishable under criminal law are prohibited. The creation of public militarized associations and armed formations is prohibited.

The creation and the activity of public associations encroaching on the health and morals of the population and citizens' rights and interests protected by law are prosecuted in accordance with the law.

Article 4. **Principles of the creation and activity of public associations**

Public associations are created and operate on the basis of the voluntary principle, the equality of their members (participants), self-management, legality, and glasnost.

All public associations operate in exercising their functions envisaged by their statutes and other instruments within the framework of the USSR Constitution, the constitutions of the Union and autonomous republics, and Soviet laws.

The participation or nonparticipation of a citizen in the activity of a public association may not serve as grounds for a limitation of his rights and liberties, as a condition for the holding of office in a state organization included, or as grounds for a failure to comply with obligations stipulated by the law.

The demand for notation on official papers of membership of this public association or the other is not permitted.

Labor legislation and also legislation governing the social security and social insurance of working people extends to employees of the apparatus of public associations.

Article 5. **The state and public associations**

The state provides for observance of the rights and legitimate interests of public associations and, in accordance with the Constitution, guarantees the conditions for their accomplishment of their statutory tasks.

The state renders youth and children's organizations material and financial support, provides for the pursuit of preferential tax policy with respect to them, and accords children's organizations the right to use premises of schools and extramural establishments, clubs, palaces and houses of culture and sports, and other grounds free of charge or on preferential terms.

Interference by state authorities and officials in the activity of public associations, as, equally, interference by public associations in the activity of state authorities and officials, is not permitted, other than in instances where this is provided for by law.

The activity of organizations of political parties and other public associations is exercised in their members' (participants') free time and at these associations' expense.

The state's financing of the activity of political parties and mass public movements pursuing political ends, except in instances of the financing of election campaigns in accordance with legislation governing elections of people's deputies, is prohibited.

Matters affecting the interests of public associations are decided in the instances stipulated by legislation by state authorities and economic organizations with the participation of or upon concordance with the pertinent public associations.

Article 6. **All-Union and other public associations**

All-Union, republic (Union and autonomous republic), interrepublic, and local public associations, and also international associations, are created and operate in the USSR.

Associations whose activity extends, in accordance with their statutory tasks, to the territory of all or a majority of the Union republics and which have their organizations in these republics pertain to all-Union public associations. An all-Union political party or trade union must have a membership of no less than 5,000 citizens of the USSR here.

Article 7. **Unions of public associations**

Public associations have the right to unite on a voluntary basis in unions of public associations.

The procedure of the formation and activity of the unions of public associations and the procedure of termination of their activity are determined in accordance with this law.

SECTION 2. FORMATION OF PUBLIC ASSOCIATIONS AND TERMINATION OF THEIR ACTIVITY

Article 8. **Creation of public associations**

Public associations are created on the initiative of no less than 10 citizens.

Public associations, other than political parties and trade unions, may be created by other public associations also.

The sponsors of the creation of a public association convene a constituent congress (conference) or general assembly, at which the statutes (regulations, other fundamental instruments) are adopted and the directive bodies formed.

Article 9. **Membership of public associations**

Citizens of the USSR are members (participants) of public associations. The statutes of a public associations, other than a political party, may provide for membership of foreign citizens or stateless persons.

Citizens who have attained 14 years of age may be members of youth organizations under the auspices of political parties.

Collective members: enterprise, establishment and organization outfits, and citizens' associations, may participate in the activity of public associations, other than political parties and trade unions, in the instances stipulated by their statutes.

Article 10. **Statutes of a public association**

The statutes of a public association should stipulate:

1) the name, purposes, and tasks of the public associations;

2) the structure of the public associations and the territory within confines of which it exercises its activity;

3) the conditions and procedure of admittance to the public association and resignation from it in cases where the association has a constant membership;

4) the rights and duties of members (participants) of the public association;

5) the jurisdiction and procedure of formation of the directive bodies of the public association and its organizations and the term of their authority;

6) sources of the formation of the resources and other property of the public association and its organizations;

7) the procedure of revisions and supplements to the statutes of the public association;

8) the procedure of termination of the activity of the public association.

The statutes may also stipulate other provisions pertaining to the activity of a public association. The statutes of a public association must not be contrary to legislation.

Article 11. **Registration of the statutes of public associations**

The statutes of an all-Union public association are registered by the USSR Ministry of Justice. The statutes of an interrepublic public association are registered by the USSR Ministry of Justice or the corresponding body of a Union republic. The statutes of international associations operating in the USSR are registered likewise. The statutes of other public associations are registered by the state authorities to which this function is entrusted by legislative instruments of the Union and autonomous republics.

For registration of the statutes of an all-Union or interrepublic public association within one month from the adoption of the statutes, an application signed by the members of the directive body of this public association specifying the place of residence of each is submitted. The statutes, minutes of the constituent congress (conference) or general assembly, and other material confirming compliance with the requirements of Articles 6 and 8 of this law are appended to the application.

An application for the registration of statutes is examined within a period of two months following its receipt.

The procedure and timeframe of the registration of the statutes of other public associations are determined by legislative instruments of the USSR and the Union and autonomous republics.

Revisions and supplements to the statutes of public associations are to be registered in the same procedure and within the same timeframe as the registration of the statutes.

The bodies registering the statutes of public associations maintain a list of these associations.

A public association or its organizations (bodies) may, in accordance with civil legislation, be recognized as legal entities as of the day of registration of the statutes.

Registration fees are charged for the registration of the statutes of a public association and their subsequent revisions and supplements in the procedure and the amounts determined by legislation of the USSR and the Union and autonomous republics.

Article 12. **Refusal to register the statutes of a public association**

A public association may be refused registration of its statutes if the statutes of the public association are contrary to the provisions of Articles 3, 4, or 10 of this law or if statutes of a public association with the same name have already been registered.

In the event of a refusal to register statutes, the applicants are notified of this in writing with specification of the provisions of legislation to which the submitted statutes are contrary.

A refusal to register the statutes of a public association may be appealed in court and examined in the procedure laid down by legislation governing civil procedure.

A refusal to register the statutes of an all-Union or interrepublic public association may be appealed in the USSR Supreme Court.

Article 13. **Symbols of public associations**

Public associations may have as symbols emblems, flags, and pennants.

The emblems of public associations are approved by their directive bodies in accordance with their statutes. The emblems of public associations may not serve to propagandize aims specified in Part 2 of Article 3 of this law.

Flags and pennants are to be officially registered in the established procedure.

Article 14. **Termination of the activity of public associations**

The activity of public associations may be terminated by way of reorganization (merger, affiliation, separation) or liquidation.

Public associations are reorganized in accordance with decisions of their congresses (conferences) or general assemblies. The statutes of the public associations reformed following reorganization are registered in the procedure determined by Article 11 of this law.

A public association is liquidated in accordance with the decision of a congress (conference) or general assembly or on the grounds and in the procedure stipulated by Article 22 of this law.

The property of a public association liquidated in accordance with a decision of its congress (conference) or general assembly is channeled into the purposes specified by its statutes.

SECTION 3. RIGHTS AND CONDITIONS OF THE ACTIVITY OF PUBLIC ASSOCIATIONS

Article 15. **Rights of public associations**

The rights of public associations are enshrined in their statutes.

For the accomplishment of the purposes and tasks defined in the statutes, program documents, and other deeds the public associations freely disseminate information concerning their purposes and activity, and in the instances and procedure stipulated by legislation enjoy also the following rights:

participate in the formation of the organs of state power and administration;

exercise legislative initiative;

participate in the formulation of the decisions of the organs of state power and administration;

represent and defend the legitimate interests of their members (participants) in the state and public authorities;

exercise other authority envisaged by this law and other instruments of legislation of the USSR and the Union and autonomous republics.

Article 16. **Political parties, mass public movements, and trade unions**

Expressing the political wishes of their members, parties set as their main tasks participation in the formation of the organs of state power and administration and also in the exercise of power through their representatives elected to the soviets of people's deputies.

Parties have program documents published for general information. Parties are equal before the law.

Parties have the right to nominate candidates for people's deputy, by common list included, to perform election canvassing, and to structure groups of their supporters who are deputies in the corresponding soviets of people's deputies.

Mass public movements pursue political or other ends and do not have a constant membership.

Servicemen and persons occupying positions in law enforcement authorities are guided in their official activity by the exigencies of the laws and are not bound by the decisions of political parties and mass public movements pursuing political ends.

In relations with state authorities, economic organizations, and cooperative and other public associations, trade unions represent and defend the interests of the members of trade unions in the sphere of production and the socioeconomic and cultural spheres. All trade unions are equal before the law.

Political parties and trade unions have only constant individual membership.

Article 17. **Production and economic activity of public associations**

In the procedure determined by legislation, public associations exercise production and economic activity and create enterprises and financially autonomous organizations possessing the rights of legal entity solely for the purpose of accomplishing the statutory tasks.

Income from the production and economic activity of public associations may not be redistributed among the members (participants) of these associations and is used only for accomplishing the statutory tasks; the public associations' use of their resources for charitable purposes, even if not specified in the statutes, is permitted.

The enterprises and organizations created by the public associations make budget payments in the procedure and the amounts determined by law.

Article 18. **Property of public associations**

Public associations and their organizations may own buildings, installations, housing, equipment, implements, cultural-educational and health-improvement property, monetary resources, stock and other securities, and other property necessary to materially support the activity specified by their statutes. Public associations may also own publishing houses, other enterprises, and charitable institutions created from the resources of these associations in accordance with the purposes specified in their statutes.

Legislative instruments of the USSR and the Union and autonomous republics may determine types of property which, for considerations of state and public security or

in accordance with international treaties, may not be owned by public associations.

The monetary resources of the public associations are formed from initiation fees and membership dues if such payment is stipulated by the statutes; voluntary contributions and donations; proceeds from the organization of lectures, exhibitions, sports and other activities, and lotteries; income from production, economic, and publishing activity; and other proceeds not prohibited by law.

Political parties and mass public movements pursuing political ends do not have the right to obtain financial and other material assistance from foreign states, organizations, and citizens.

Political parties publish their budgets annually for general information.

The property of public associations is protected by law.

The competence of the unions and the associations that are a part of them in respect of the possession, enjoyment, and disposal of property belonging to these unions and the associations that are a part of them is determined by the statutes of the unions of public associations.

Article 19. **The mass media and publishing activity of public associations**

Public associations have the right to establish mass media and to engage in publishing activity in accordance with legislation of the USSR and the Union and autonomous republics on the press and other mass media.

SECTION 4. CONTROL OF THE ACTIVITY OF PUBLIC ASSOCIATIONS

Liability for Breaches of Legislation

Article 20. **Control and supervision of the activity of public associations**

The financial authorities exercise supervision of the sources of income of the public associations, the amounts of the monies they obtain, and the payment of taxes in accordance with tax legislation.

Supervision of the public associations' compliance with the law is exercised by the procuracy authorities.

The state authority which has registered the statutes of a public association exercises supervision of compliance with the provisions of the statutes with respect to the purposes of the activity of the public association. The registering authority has the right to require of the directive body of the public association the submittal of decisions adopted, send its representatives to participate in activities conducted by the public association, and obtain explanations from members of the public association and other citizens on questions connected with compliance with the statutes by the public association.

Article 21. **Principles of liability**

Breaches of legislation governing public associations entail criminal, administrative, material, or other liability in accordance with legislation of the USSR and Union and autonomous republics.

Liability for a breach of legislation governing public associations is borne by the officials of state and public authorities and also citizens guilty of this.

In instances of a breach of legislation governing public associations a public association, including one that has failed to register its statutes, is liable in accordance with the law.

In the event of a public association engaging in actions which go beyond the purposes and tasks determined by its statutes or which break the law, the directive body of this association may be issued a written caution by the authority that registered the statutes of the public association or by the prosecutor.

Article 22. **Liquidation of a public association in the event of it violating the requirements of the statutes or the law**

A public association is liquidated in accordance with a ruling of a court of law in the event of the public association having engaged in actions specified by Part 2 of Article 3 of this law.

The court may liquidate a public association upon a repeat perpetration within a year of actions specified by Part 4 of Article 21 of this law.

Property of a public association liquidated according to a ruling of a court of law may revert to state ownership without compensation.

All-Union and interrepublic public associations are liquidated according to a ruling of the USSR Supreme Court in accordance with submissions of the USSR Prosecutor General, the USSR Ministry of Justice, and the body that registered the statutes of the interrepublic public association, and also in accordance with the submissions of other authorities and officials thus empowered by USSR legislation. A ruling of the USSR Supreme Court on liquidation of a public association is not subject to appeal.

Other public associations are liquidated by a court of law in the procedure provided for by legislation of the Union and autonomous republics.

SECTION 5. INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS OF PUBLIC ASSOCIATIONS

International Public Associations. International Treaties

Article 23. **International relations of public associations**

In accordance with their statutes, public associations may join international public (nongovernment) associations, maintain direct international contacts and relations, and conclude the corresponding agreements.

Article 24. **International public associations**

A public association created in the USSR is deemed international if its activity, in accordance with its statutes, extends to the territory of the USSR and one or more foreign states. The statutes of an international public association are to be registered in accordance with Articles 10 and 11 of this law.

If a Soviet public association joins an international public association created overseas as a collective member, the statutes of the latter are subject to registration also.

A public association which has extended its activity to the territory of a foreign state submits its statutes to the USSR Ministry of Justice or the corresponding authority of a Union republic with the necessary revisions and supplements for reregistration.

Public associations whose purposes are the strengthening of peace, the development of international cooperation, and other types of humanitarian activity may enjoy the privileges determined by legislation.

The provisions of this law extend to the activity of the branches (affiliates and other structural subdivisions) of the public associations of foreign states formed on USSR territory.

Article 25. **International treaties**

If an international treaty of the USSR determines rules different to those contained in this law, the rules of the international treaty apply.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, president of the USSR
[Dated] The Kremlin, Moscow, 9 October 1990

Frolov Holds News Conference on Role of Press

PM2510100190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by S. Kolesnikov and I. Podsvirov: "Our Newspaper Has Its Own Face"]

[Text] I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chief editor of PRAVDA, held a press conference for Soviet and foreign correspondents yesterday in the Oktyabrskaya Hotel, at the CPSU Central Committee press center. The news conference was opened by the press center's leader, G.V. Pryakhin. This time talk was mainly about the role and place of PRAVDA and the party press and other mass media at the present stage of perestroyka, under the conditions of the multiparty system and the transition to the market economy.

Answering numerous questions, I.T. Frolov stressed that real political life is now only being established in the country: New parties and public movements are being created and various blocs and politicized groups are emerging. Unfortunately, many still have no experience of the civilized, truly democratic conduct of debates, nor do the relevant laws exist with whose aid it would be possible to direct the discussion of acute and complex problems into the channel of constructive decisions.

The difficulties of the party press manifested during subscription reflect the difficulties in the process of the renewal of the party itself and its primary organizations. Communists must resolutely and competently halt extremist manifestations and engage more in creative activity.

In this connection a staffer of the journal VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS asked I.T. Frolov the following question:

"I should like to ask you, as a scientist and member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, what must be done to overcome social sciences' lag behind life?"

"For a start," the PRAVDA chief editor replied, "it is essential to ascertain the sectors on which the social sciences are holding fast. I think sociomoral problems have been studied particularly feebly in our country. I say this in full awareness of their importance—as chairman of the CPSU Central Committee commission for science, education, and culture. Diktat and the leadership's authoritarian methods are to blame for everything. I once experienced for myself the adverse effect of administrative command interference. We must determine how, in what forms, the party can influence this sphere. In my view the party's support for everything new, interesting, and talented is essential now. The rejection of diktat in no way means protecting the party from the creative elaboration of problems.

One more question or rather opinion which was heard in the hall: The CPSU should determine more precisely which of the political trends it should enter into a bloc with, those with which it should reach a compromise, and those against which it should struggle.

"A tough orientation toward an implacable struggle between different views is hardly justified," I.T. Frolov noted. "Sometimes PRAVDA is rebuked: Why, people say, do we not always adopt a precise stance? But when you ask what stance, it turns out it is often the most retrograde, antiperestroyka stance. And it must be understood and not rejected out of hand: It is the line toward the intensification of perestroyka, toward democratization and glasnost, it is the line of the CPSU's renewal, of creative Marxism and internationalism. But here we should not forget a respectful attitude toward dissent and other viewpoints."

Frolov's Comments Assessed

LD2510124190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1410 GMT 24 Oct 90

[Interview with reporter Aleksandr Nefedov by unidentified announcer, comprising Nefedov's report on a 24 October CPSU Central Committee press center meeting with PRAVDA editor Ivan Frolov by unidentified attendees—live]

[Excerpts] Now the promised meeting in the studio with my colleague, our correspondent Aleksandr Nefedov, who today was at the press center of the CPSU Central Committee, where there was a meeting with the editor of the newspaper PRAVDA, Ivan Timofeyevich Frolov. Now, Aleksandr, what are your private impressions of the meeting?

[Nefedov] The whole meeting took exactly two hours, quite enough time to find out everything you want to know.

[Announcer] Did you manage to do that?

[Nefedov] I did and I did not. Like perhaps all Soviet and foreign journalists, I was mainly interested in two questions: First, how did the well-known conflict in the editorial board end? Second, the opinion of the PRAVDA editor about the status of subscriptions to the paper. [passage omitted] Frolov agreed that reader interest in his paper had fallen. According to figures for October, only 504,000 people had subscribed to PRAVDA, compared to an expected 5 million subscribers. Yet, Ivan Timofeyevich said it is not worth changing the paper's image.

[Announcer] What is the reason for this position, Aleksandr?

[Nefedov] Well, I think it can be explained very simply. Frolov himself said this: It is so that those who have already subscribed to the paper in its present form should not return their subscriptions, saying we are being offered something quite different from what we have chosen. The PRAVDA newspaper, as you know, is the mouthpiece of the CPSU Central Committee, and this undoubtedly is reflected in its content.

[Announcer] From what we know, and from daily information, the party is also undergoing changes and alterations.

[Nefedov] True, there are changes, but first the party itself must define how it is to be, and then the paper will in turn define itself. [passage omitted] He [Frolov] added: We want to keep our close ideological ties with the CPSU Central Committee in everything except, of course, economic independence.

[Announcer] What? Is there to be a division of property, or are large incomes expected?

[Nefedov] Big incomes, big plans, the creation, with the help of newspaper magnates from the United States, Britain, and France, of a foreign edition with the big title of PRAVDA INTERNATIONAL.

[Announcer] Extraordinary.

[Nefedov] An unusual title. Creation of its own television studio, which will produce clips and programs to be shown on Central Television—there is already an agreement on this with Gosteleradio chairman Nenashev. There will probably be a Sunday supplement to the paper. And so on and so forth. As a result of savings from this work, the paper will quite probably lower its price in the future, its cost.

[Announcer] Aleksandr, you said the paper's editor-in-chief insistently posed the question of the future bias of the paper, of creative plans, as the saying goes. Could you go into more detail on this?

[Hefedov] About creative plans, Frolov said that even now the paper was ready to sign contracts with a whole range of our famous writers and publicists at sums which will be two or three times higher than the usual pay for a staff member.

[Announcer] Contract system, eh?

[Nefedov] Contract system, yes, but the high sum, Ivan Frolov said, is due to the fact that they are ready to pay a premium for talent. Many of them are already bringing their work to PRAVDA, Frolov noted. Take Boris Oleynik—his material has already gone into print. Questions were raised on the material, he said. Many of his colleagues had said: Yes, Frolov certainly did not write that. But Oleynik's copy deserves the reader's attention, and so it has already appeared in PRAVDA. To tell the truth, the editor-in-chief of the paper admitted that he was a conservative and that was why he preferred to stay in the framework of the style he had originally chosen. If I am brought material, he said, and I see that it is not our material, not like PRAVDA, I do not edit the material. I have 22 years of experience of work in journalism and I just throw it in the wastebasket. [passage omitted]

[Announcer] Was anything said at the meeting today about the conflict that has been talked and written about so much?

[Hefedov] After heated debates in the PRAVDA editorial office, Frolov said, you remember, that he could not and would not work on that paper. He even posed the question in the Central Committee. But he got the support of the Politburo and secretaries of the Central Committee, and so today things are quite quite diferent. He says: I must and shall work on the PRAVDA newspaper.

[Announcer] So we must wait and see what PRAVDA will be like next year and wish it collective success.

CPSU Warnings Against 'Willful Press' Criticized

91US0042A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
14 Oct 90 Union Edition p 1

[Article by Anatoliy Druzenko under the "Political Diary" rubric: "It Is Hardly Worth Biting One's Ears Off in a Fit of Frenzy"]

[Text] The main agenda item for the recently completed CPSU Central Committee plenum was the transfer of the economy to market relations. But, as at previous party forums, another traditional theme was also sounded, namely, the role and place of the mass media in our

confusing times. If we were to express in just a few words the assessment given by some of those who spoke, then to paraphrase we might say that today the press is not only a collective propagandist and agitator but also a collective disorganizer.

This is the just the latest occasion on which the press and radio and television have been depicted as some kind of crafty malefactor that specially whips up passions, is tainted with ambition, is pushing the people toward the abyss, holds nothing sacred, and so forth. It is the latest occasion on which, under various pretexts and in various kinds of wordy "wrapping," certain members of the CPSU Central Committee tried at the plenum to distinguish in the principle of glasnost the supposed exceptionally destructive and damaging influence on the public awareness and to express the entirely unconstructive thesis that it is they, the uncontrolled journalists, who are guilty of placing interminable burdens on the people.

I will not ask whether or not this is in fact so—the reader can look into this himself. I will ask a different question: Why is it that every time there is a plenum or some other high-level party meeting there are always speakers who raise the bugaboo of a willful press—the source of all our derelictions, troubles, cataclysms, and so forth? And in fact, why? Let me try to explain. In general at all times—during the time of the cult and during the period of stagnation—ideology has always been the most conservative part of party milieu. In science, in the sphere of material production, in the defense complex, the circumstances have been forced, something was being done, experiments were being conducted, and attempts were even made at reform, but not in the spiritual sphere. "My ideology is my castle!" This was the precept of Suslov (and his ilk) that triumphed. For many years, through the endless decades, this castle seemed unassailable. No fresh winds could blow through its narrow windows. The enormous army of "castle-keepers" (and alas! the author of this commentary is one of them) served the inviolability and "purity" of the dogmas. But times have changed. Finally, normal human principles have triumphed. Glasnost has been proclaimed, even freedom of speech, but the "castle" still maintains a defensive circle and regularly switches to a "circular" offensive.

It seems to me that things have been shaped in such a way that the ideological part of the largest, and formerly leading, political party is essentially being wagged by the tail of events and often demonstrates passiveness with respect to the very complicated processes taking place in the country. Yes, when these processes are dealt with in the press extreme views are often expressed, and there are extremist assessments and proposals, and there are press organs that stand in direct opposition to the course being pursued by the CPSU. It would seem that all of this is in the order of things if we have set out on the path of democratization. However, for a whole range of ideological workers, it seems to me, different thinking on the newspaper pages still evokes an active dislike and a desire, as they say, "not to let it pass."

It seems to me that the TASS chief demonstrated this approach in a very marked way in his speech at the plenum. A significant part of what he said was devoted precisely to the attitude toward different political thinking. But the way in which this attitude is expressed! What assessments, what epithets! As if there were no such thing as a multiparty system and pluralism. They are interfering with us, of course, but who? "Forces." Nationality, "opposition" forces. And if they are opposition forces then they are undoubtedly "destructive." To what do they give priority? You are right, to "political ambition to the detriment of society's economic and social interests." The list of characteristics could go on and on. It is quite eloquent, and requires no comment: "intoxicated with a certain amount of success;" "acting in accordance with a purely destructive principle;" "well-coordinated antisocialist campaign;" "dealers in political narcotics;" "many healers dangerous for society have appeared;" "a flock of 'hawks.'"

The political delineation in journalism and among journalists that is natural for a democratic and rule-of-law state obviously puts the chief of one of the largest telegraph agencies in the world on his guard.

Moving ineluctably to the question, "What is to be done?" L.P. Kravchenko—we must give him his due—reminded us of the law on the press that has been passed, and recognized that "prohibitive measures are now a thing of the past." But what does he propose instead of prohibition? Making decisive use of the cadre lever (what he has in mind is the appointment of leaders in the party press), and more frequent contact with them; he calls this "dialogue," "providing information," "taking counsel," but what we hear in these words is a yearning for the notorious instruction meetings that were so frequent in the past and that entire generations of journalists had to attend (let me quote, and the reader can judge for himself: "So I want to ask when did the editors of the party newspapers and journals last meet here in Moscow for training and collation of positions?")

The measures proposed by the TASS chief to bring order to the party mass media were similar: special review of the issue, devise a new system for party work in the media. Or this: "the party press is simply obliged to alter public opinion"; "the time has come to switch the creative forces of journalism"; "support editorial collectives"; and then, "party committees will acquire in them a reliable support and reliable allies in this present crisis situation."

It is not difficult to see the continuation of the well-known list of historical statements: "collective propagandist," "driving belt," "assistant"; all new terms now.... And this would be nothing, in my opinion, except that there is a clumsiness in the fact that this entire program of improving leadership in the party press is being put forward not by the leader of a party press organ, for example the editor of PRAVDA or SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, which would probably be logical, but by the chief of the government telegraph agency. Yes, he is a

member of the CPSU, and moreover a member of the Central Committee, and he has the right to hold a position, but here should we not take into account the circumstance of the post that Leonid Petrovich holds in the state, where, it seems, the monopoly of any particular party has been abandoned and the principle of the multiparty system recognized?

And finally, the last thing—concerning the ears mentioned in the title. Tossing out the latest reproach to opposition forces, incidentally, like all the others, not backed by argument, at one point the general director of TASS expressed an emotional and in a certain sense even ironic thought:

"Political masochism is being implemented when, in a fit of frenzy, we want to bite off our own ears but, since we cannot reach them, we bite off our neighbor's instead."

Never mind our ears! Let us consider the meaning of the thought expressed, the occasion of this awkward witticism. In my view, "political masochism" is the name for exactly what has been done to the objective process of thinking about the road we have traversed, the point we have reached, and the assessment of that political force that has led the people along that road. And to the force and the party that have openly stated this to the people and, since they are monopolists, that have shown no interest in how the people assess them. And are not the attempts to avoid this assessment even today dictated by the desire for former comfort?

Writers' Leader 'Concerned' About New Press Law

LD2310164290 Moscow World Service in Russian 1030 GMT 23 Oct 90

[INTERFAX report; from the "Soviet Chronicle" of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program]

[Text] Vladimir Karpov, the leader of the USSR writers' organization, is concerned about the situation which has taken shape in the sphere of rights to found mass media products. In accordance with a new law, not only organizations but also the collectives of editorial offices themselves and separate individuals may become the founders of press organs. For this reason, at many publications—which were previously under the aegis of the Writers' Union—the journalists issuing them have declared their rights. In Karpov's opinion, this will lead to an estrangement of literary journals from the 10,000-strong Writers' Union. Karpov fears that publishers will not publish authors they consider unsuitable. And this may be considered more terrible than state censorship.

Petrunya Allegations Against Youth Paper Rejected

PM2410185990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 90 p 4

[Unattributed report: "Results of the Year: Three Deputies' Investigations"]

[Text] Yesterday the latest "opinion" from TASS Political Observer V. Petrunya was received via TASS channels. This time it was in defense of glasnost. It devoted the following passage to KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA: "...another (newspaper—Editor's Note) which claims to reflect young people's interests publishes slanderous fabrications about the head of state's dacha."

Bearing in mind that the concept of "slander" has a clear-cut legal meaning, we could contest the "observer's opinion." Fortunately, the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals' Special Commission has spared us that. A few weeks ago it conveyed to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium its conclusions after checking up on our article "on the head of state's dacha." If the TASS observer had familiarized himself with these conclusions, he would not have needed to draw his own.

For your information: Over the past two months there have been three deputies' investigations by the USSR Supreme Soviet. **And they have all been connected with articles in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA.** Apart from the above instance, the Youth Affairs Committee investigated the activities of the USSR KGB following the publication of the interview with former KGB Major General Oleg Kalugin (KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 20 June). The Committee for Defense and State Security Questions is studying the circumstances surrounding the sudden transfer of military subunits to Moscow this September (KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 15 September, 4 October, and 12 October).

The fate of the first commission—examining KGB activity—was the most dramatic. Despite the demand of more than 100 USSR people's deputies and two Supreme Soviet committees this question was not included on the current session agenda. Nonetheless, we were told by USSR People's Deputy A. Plotnikov that an independent deputies' commission is actually being set up. USSR People's Deputy Academician Yu. Ryzhov has agreed to head it. We pledge that we will not only report the results of these three investigations but, as used to be stated in historical reports, we will "continue to pursue definite work in this direction."

Public Figures View KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA

PM2310144190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 90 p 4

[Unsigned "Society Diary" column of comments on KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA by public figures]

[Text] V.A. Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR KGB:

Of course I intend to subscribe to your newspaper. I have an equivocal and, moreover, not disinterested attitude to it since at one time I was involved in Komsomol [V.I. Lenin Communist Youth League] work. I would like to see a more constructive approach in items that are published. What I like in your newspaper is its enthusiasm and desire to see our society cleaner.

I would like fresh young forces to join state security bodies.

I would like to see in your newspaper more cognitive items sparking a thirst for knowledge in young people: Just look at how many new names there are—Berdyayev, for example; previously we had only heard about his existence—and modern foreign philosophers....

B.N. Yeltsin is on leave in Kislovodsk. In the words of his aides, he has not changed his view of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA as "the best newspaper" and will continue to read it and count on its support.

S.S. Shatalin, academician and member of the Presidential Council:

I have subscribed to KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA; I like the newspaper, first and foremost the incisive and interesting way it poses problems.

V.P. Astafyev:

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA is the most militant newspaper. Admittedly its name has become outdated, I think.... I have little time for reading newspapers and have had to almost halve my number of subscriptions for next year, but I have subscribed to KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA.

D.T. Yazov, USSR minister of defense:

By virtue of my duties I have to read all the newspapers—good and bad alike. So I have subscribed to KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. I don't think everything you publish is bad....

Orlov Deflects Criticism of Gorbachev Policies

LD2410152390 Moscow TASS in English 1506 GMT 24 Oct 90

[By TASS world service analyst Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS—The Gorbachev phenomenon has been analysed in hundreds of articles and books in the West. Former British Foreign Secretary David Owen has contributed his bit as well.

Last week, he addressed from Cambridge Western leaders, calling them to scale down the euphoria connected with the Soviet president. The nature of power in the Soviet Union has remained largely unchanged, he admonished. Owen urged Western politicians to try and dissuade Gorbachev from his search for a third way, between Western democracy and Stalinist communism.

I share many ideas voiced by the British politician, including his call for a critical analysis: There is no sense in building a policy in illusions.

However, I find it somewhat confusing that in debunking the Soviet leader's "third way", David Owen fails to follow his own recommendation. He invites Gorbachev to draw on a Western model, committing a classical fallacy. He presumes that Western experience can be easily transplanted to the Soviet soil in a mechanical way and forgets that conditions here differ dramatically from those in Britain.

Let us momentarily overlook the thesis of the Western model's desirability, and try and clarify its applicability to the Soviet Union.

Is the full-blooded development of capitalism (Marx-style), or, if you please, free market and democracy, hampered only by Gorbachev's reluctance to discard communist ideals? Would things go better if he retired from the Communist Party, publicly proclaimed the October Revolution an error and called on the people to surge towards capitalism?

Hardly. The man in the street here views the idea of market relations with apprehension, to say the least. The Soviet Communist Party, although going through a severe crisis, retains much of its authority and power not only because its rule has been unchallenged for 70 years, but because the socialist idea—even in its primitive and distorted form—is deeply rooted in the minds and hearts of the Soviet people. It is dangerous blindness to overlook the fact.

Politics, they say, is the art of the possible. But it does not follow from this truism that [that which] was impossible yesterday is impossible today, and will remain so tomorrow.

However, for this "tomorrow" to materialise, painstaking efforts are needed to realise an about-turn in people's minds.

This is the kind of work Gorbachev has been at for the past five years. The notorious "third way", Owen seeks to deflate, is a visible result (an intermediate one, I am sure) of these efforts.

Suffice it to recall what we were like five years ago, at the outset. Was the then society capable of accepting even the smallest bit of today's ideas: a multi-party system, the market, private property and freedom of the press and travel?

Had Gorbachev come out with his plan for the transition to the market at that time, perestroika would have been finished within two weeks.

Naturally, the 1990 Nobel Peace Prize would hardly have been awarded to Gorbachev. It would have sooner gone to the man who devised a practical way to send a space anti-missile shield into the sky above the West....

Owen calls on the Soviet president to "confirm his leadership by a popular vote". The implication is clear: Gorbachev became president despite his plummeting popularity. Suffice it to recall Margaret Thatcher's stance during the strike by British miners, who, very much like their Soviet brothers-in-class today, failed to grasp the intent of the British "perestroika" at that time. Did her plummeting popularity with workers at that time prevent the Iron Lady from staying in power for two more terms?

Personally, I am confident that, just as in Britain, popularity will return to the leader with the first tangible fruits of perestroika. The main thing now is to keep to the road.

Tarazevich Says New Union Treaty 'Arduous' Task

LD1710011490 Moscow TASS in English 2130 GMT 16 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Zenkevic]

[Text] Moscow October 16 TASS—Work on shaping a new Union treaty, which is due to give exhaustive replies to question about the image of the future Union, it at all, is very arduous and poses a lot of difficult questions, Georgiy Tarazevich, who heads the parliamentary group preparing the new Union treaty, told TASS on Tuesday.

The future of the Soviet union will depend to a large extent on which way towards the market members of the Soviet parliament will opt for.

In this light, Tarazevich criticised the Shatalin plan for the transition to a market economy which proposed dismantling economic management at the Union government level. This plan, Tarazevich said, does not ensure the firm federal budget and is vague about the federal property and currency fund. Such a state will be ignored by many and trusted by few, he said.

Tarazevich said splitting the country during the transition towards market relations was extremely dangerous. The "distribution" of federal property to republics and regions will be very complicated and will need much additional time. Moreover, the distribution according to the principle "everything on my territory is mine" is not fair because one republic may get much more property than another owing to the earlier division of labour.

The disintegration of federal property, Tarazevich believes, will further disrupt economic links between enterprises. The disruption of supplies has already placed mammoth industrial enterprises on the verge of catastrophe. Full or partial closure of some of them threatens mass unemployment and probably social upheavals.

In addition, Tarazevich stressed, the weakening of the Soviet Union makes doubtful its ability to honour international agreements and commitments.

A new Union is seen by Tarazevich as a commonwealth of sovereign republics in which all peoples will be granted the opportunity to realise their national desire for freedom and independence and in which proper social guarantees and equal civil rights and freedoms will be secured to every citizen regardless of his nationality or place of residence.

For this, the new Union must remain a single sovereign state with its territory, citizenship, property, finances, legislation and state structures. Republics voluntarily joining the Union will delegate to it powers which are more effective and profitable if wielded by joint efforts, through respective federal bodies.

The defence of the federal and republican sovereignty and territorial integrity also calls for a single approach. Splitting this complex will undermine the country's defence capacity and destroy the present system of managing the Armed Forces.

Moreover, it will undoubtedly undermine the military-political parity, which will do harm to the security of countries of the whole world.

The Constitution is an indispensible attribute of a sovereign state, Tarazevich said. The Soviet Constitution must be based on the Union treaty and be consistent with it, he said.

Procuracy Official Interviewed on KGB Oversight

91UF0059A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 42, 17 Oct 90 p 11

[Interview with V. Ilyukhin, chief of the USSR Procuracy's Directorate To Oversee the Execution of Laws on State Security, member of the board of the USSR Procuracy, and legal adviser third class, by I. Gamayunov; place and date not given: "Without Hypnosis": "Overseeing the KGB—Myth or Reality?"]

[Text] **What was Timofeyev-Resovskiy guilty of? Will Gumilev be acquitted? How did Yezhov and Yagoda turn out to be temporarily innocent?**

[Gamayunov] In the recent past the KGB seemed to be some kind of divine office. It was inhabited by rulers of destinies who were able to jail a person merely because he had read Solzhenitsyn. Several months ago you, Viktor Ivanovich, were placed at the head of the procuracy's oversight over the KGB. It seems that few people know what this is. In the name of those who do not know, I would like to ask whether this oversight is a myth or reality?

[Ilyukhin] I suppose that it is reality. But I should specify in which sphere of the KGB's functions it operates. It encompasses control over the legality of investigation, administrative practice, and confinement. Everything else—intelligence and counterintelligence—does not come under the jurisdiction of our oversight. Those activities cannot be regulated by law. It is unrealistic. Although, for example, here is a criminal case that has come to my desk which began with a counterintelligence operation.

[Gamayunov] What is it about?

[Ilyukhin] It is an attempt to betray the fatherland. A certain citizen sought meetings with employees of embassies and special services in order to hand over military secrets—that is what it says in the accusation. The meetings were successful, but he did not realize that he was speaking with undercover workers and counterintelligence agents.

[Gamayunov] But could it not be that he went to those meetings with other goals? Let us suppose that he wished to register to leave the country as quickly as possible, and those whom he talked with skillfully provoked him into making dangerous admissions.

[Ilyukhin] This will be examined once more before the indictment is rendered.

[Gamayunov] Then in any sphere of KGB operations you guarantee to protect the citizen from arbitrariness and illegality?

[Ilyukhin] On the practical level, yes. The arrest, booking, and procedures in the KGB's confinement cells are all within our oversight. If we observe that a person has been put under confinement illegally, we will immediately free him.

[Gamayunov] And how legal is confinement of a person in a psychiatric institute, such as the case of V. Novodvorskaya, one of the leaders of the "Democratic Union" party?

[Ilyukhin] This is not permitted without the approval of the procurator. In the case of Novodvorskaya, who was sent for a psychiatric examination, there was approval. And there were legal grounds. Incidentally, the KGB has nothing to do with the Novodvorskaya case.

[Gamayunov] However, it is well known that very recently illegal confinement in psychiatric hospitals was a common matter for the KGB.

[Ilyukhin] Unfortunately it is true that oversight was insufficiently strict. There were investigators and judges of those same civil organs—and I stress civil organs, not KGB—by whose hands such things happened.

[Gamayunov] But did they not happen because investigators and judges, to put it delicately, were under the hypnosis of that divine office which believes itself to be inaccessibly omnipotent?

[Ilyukhin] Yes, of course, such an image of the KGB existed in past decades and contributed to things to some degree. But the main cause, in my opinion, lies in contemptuous execution of the law by all law enforcement organs in those years.

[Gamayunov] Let us return to the present.

[Ilyukhin] Let us. The KGB cannot by itself arrest a person. Only with the approval of a procurator of an oblast or his deputy, no one lower. Incidentally, I wish to note that the investigative organs of the KGB are guided by those same procedural rules that guide investigators of the militia or procuracy. And the same applies to judicial review of cases. The sole exception is that a KGB court case is closed if there is a danger of revealing state secrets. And the procuracy's powers to oversee the KGB is the same: We can remove a case from the investigating organs of state security and transfer it to another investigative organ. Our instructions to the investigators of the KGB are binding. We have the right at any time, day or night, to visit the KGB's investigative confinement cells.

[Gamayunov] Special permission is not required for such a visit?

[Ilyukhin] No. Our identity card is enough. We can attend any stage of investigative activities, such as the interrogation. And we have the right to adopt any ruling in a criminal case, including releasing a person.

[Gamayunov] What kinds of crimes does the KGB investigate most often today?

[Ilyukhin] The traditional ones, of course: Espionage, betrayal of the fatherland, and sabotage. But lately there have also been many cases of violation of laws on hard-currency transactions, contraband, and racketeering. The workers of the KGB have better technical means than their colleagues in other departments. They make videotapes—on cases already underway, of course—as blackmailers conduct negotiations and as they receive the money. The arrest is also filmed.

[Gamayunov] Such arrests have already been shown on television many times. But the filming is done from a distance and we do not hear the conversation between the blackmailers.

[Ilyukhin] But why not.... The victims are usually rigged with a microphone, and in the courtroom the conversation is reproduced in its entirety.... Another category of cases is abuse of official powers. An investigation was recently completed concerning customs officials at the Sheremetevo-II Airport. There were 22 people brought to justice—they permitted the import of contraband in exchange for bribes. And here is one more subject: Along with his accomplices, the deputy director of affairs for the Council of Ministers of one southern republic handed out jobs in exchange for bribes. The total sum was about 800,000 rubles [R]. A no less complicated case which was brought to court thanks to the investigators of

the KGB was the murder of two workers of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Armenia.

[Gamayunov] What were the motives for the murder?

[Ilyukhin] Fear of exposure. And the son of a former procurator of the republic was involved in the crime, so it was difficult for the investigators to overcome the "official barriers." Illegal bank transactions have been uncovered with the participation of investigators of the KGB—large sums were handed out to fake cooperatives in exchange for bribes. And, of course, all crimes connected with interethnic conflicts are investigated for the most part by the KGB.

[Gamayunov] If you look at the KGB's investigative work within the total volume, including the militia and the procuracy, what percentage does it involve?

[Ilyukhin] A small percentage. On the whole it involves less than two to three percent around the country. As a result, it is not so very difficult for the procuracy to carry out the necessary oversight.

[Gamayunov] I worry that the majority of the readers will view your statement as a declaration, an attempt to elevate the KGB, which has been criticized lately, in their eyes. After all, this two to three percent may also worry people if one imagines that oversight over the investigators is only formal and they are free to do as they wish.

[Ilyukhin] I would call this fear outdated. After all, there are key moments when the procurator erects legal barriers to illegality: They are the arrest, the nature of confinement, and the course and methods of the investigation. We get involved at any point.

[Gamayunov] Can you cite an example where the procuracy freed an innocent man?

[Ilyukhin] Of course. There was the recent "Gabashvili case." He worked at a trade delegation in Yemen, went to Israel for medical treatment, and at customs he was suspected of carrying contraband. Criminal proceedings were instituted and an investigation was conducted. It turned out that there was indeed contraband.

[Gamayunov] What kind of contraband?

[Ilyukhin] The problem was that Gabashvili and his wife had diplomatic passports and did not undergo a customs examination. And although the customs agent could not help but notice the ring on the wife's hands or the earrings in her ears (in addition they notified the customs agent that they had dollars), at first they were permitted through the checkpoint and then later required to enter all their valuables on a declaration. These valuables were also taken for contraband. We investigated this case for a long time, and I should say that we could not come to a single opinion. But after it was studied here in this office where we are speaking, I came to the conclusion that no crime had occurred. We took the Gabashvili case from the KGB and halted it.

[Gamayunov] How did the KGB react to such a turn of events?

[Ilyukhin] Normally, as you might expect. You may suspect me of trying to elevate them in the eyes of the readers. But I am only stating a fact: In the KGB no one is ruled by ambition. In any case, I personally have not run across it. I understand—the shadow of the past pursues this organization. But several decades have passed since those times when the NKVD [People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs] held sway. The system of state security has fundamentally changed. A new generation of workers has arrived. They are people of my age, in their forties. I went to school with many of them. They do not have any connection with that dark and distant past.

[Gamayunov] I wish to object: The problem is not just the distant past but the quite recent past as well. It was in the 1970's and the first half of the 1980's that the KGB ingeniously and stubbornly rooted out dissidents—beginning with Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov. This is why fear of this divine office still exists.

[Ilyukhin] I will speak about these years too. But first let us return to the 1930's-1950's. It is not possible to lump all the workers in these organs in one basket even in those years. There were all kinds of people there. Remember that more than 20,000 employees of the NKVD were persecuted. As for the 1970's and 1980's, I am convinced that the level of development of all law enforcement organs without exception in those years corresponded to the level of development of our whole society and state.

[Gamayunov] I cannot agree. The appearance of so-called dissidents already testified to the fact that our society was constrained by the old rules, but the repression apparat tried to destroy even the thought of such a thing. This was in those recent years. And today the basic motive for criticizing the KGB is its unwillingness to admit that its struggle against dissidents was against the people and that its movement toward internal changes of its own is much too slow.

[Ilyukhin] You may disagree with me, but let us look at the KGB's activities in the 1970's and 1980's from another side: Legislation introduced liability for anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda. For the most part the responsibility for implementing this law lay with the organs of state security. And they implemented it. As to whether they did it well or poorly or with or without excesses, that is another question.

[Gamayunov] But this implementation turned into an absurd struggle with living thought, without which society cannot develop.

[Ilyukhin] Yes, there were abuses, terrible abuses. But let us see why. Over 24 years 3,600 criminal cases were initiated as a result of this law. Under whose oversight were they conducted? The procurator's. Who gave them the rubber stamp and sent people to jail? The judges. I

emphasize this—not a tribunal or the notorious "troikas," but the people's judges.

[Gamayunov] Judges under state influence.

[Ilyukhin] Yes, you could put it that way. As a result we are now looking into judicial independence. But here I return to what I was saying: The court and the organs of the procuracy, militia, and the KGB correspond to the level of the legal development of society and the state, and they reflect society's attitudes toward laws and personal freedoms. If you want to search for the guilty, then the state itself and its particular structure bear the primary guilt, if you wish. Remember how many times our law enforcement system fouled up in those years in the fight against unconventional business executives—LITERATURNAYA GAZETA wrote a lot about it then. In this sphere there were hardly less (if not more!) dramas and tragedies, which the KGB had nothing to do with. There were many investigators who conducted these economic cases or cases concerning bribes in Uzbekistan, in which they surpassed even their predecessors in the NKVD. Therefore the question, in my view, should be put more broadly—our relation to the law in this country from the bottom to the top. Yes, of course the KGB is in need of improvement or, if you wish, reorganization. But this must not be done with the euphoria of the rally—it must be done competently. After all, we are talking about the main department ensuring the country's security.

[Gamayunov] It is difficult to object to that, but before you do an operation you need to investigate the organism.... And you probably need to remove the brand of criminal from specific people. There are two names most often mentioned today—the poet Gumilev and the scholar Timofeyev-Resovskiy. Will their cases, which were conducted under the jurisdiction of the KGB, be reexamined?

[Ilyukhin] I do not doubt it. I have studied Gumilev's case and I believe that there is no proof of his guilt. He was not involved in any counterrevolutionary activity. The case on Timofeyev-Resovskiy must be examined again—there are newly revealed circumstances. We have received a letter from scholars and witnesses in Germany: The scientific work of Timofeyev-Resovskiy during his visit to prewar Germany were not used in the Wehrmacht and in the service of Himmler. In addition to these two cases, we have a huge number of others. And here is one problem: The well-known presidential edict on rehabilitation, while undoubtedly humane, has complicated this effort because of one of its details. The edict, which abolished at one blow all the previous rulings on these cases, says that in the event that rehabilitation is rejected, the case must be sent to a court to clarify the legal truth. Even though oversight organs could decide such cases concerning this sorrowful memorial. Without judicial procedures.

[Gamayunov] Is it a very laborious process?

[Ilyukhin] Yes, but that is not all. It is a paradox, but imagine: The sadists and falsifiers of investigations Yezhov, Yagoda, Frinovskiy, and others convicted in the 1930's for betraying the fatherland and espionage are considered innocent until a new courtroom examination. Their guilt has to be proven anew. Incidentally, as a lawyer I can say that there was no treason in their crimes. They exceeded and abused their power, but there was no treason.

[Gamayunov] But the scale of abuse may be great enough to amount to treason.

[Ilyukhin] There must be the qualifying marks of the crime "betrayal of the fatherland," and these do not exist. You will say that it is enough to requalify the guilt for other articles of the Criminal Code, and that will settle the matter. But the problem is that this is not always possible. There is no doubt that they are criminals, but they have not been convicted for the crimes they in fact committed. In this case legal truth was disregarded in the interests of temporary political interests.

[Gamayunov] What is to be done?

[Ilyukhin] We, the oversight organs, should be granted the right to rule in these instances.

[Gamayunov] Let us return to daily routine of the KGB. What is your attitude to the insertion of agents (they are delicately called assistants) into public movements and organizations?... I ask about this because I cannot forget a story written in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA (the feature story "Noose" by N. Popkov): In the past, one such "assistant" was a convict who was involved in the black market. He was inserted into a Rostov civil rights organization which was functioning, incidentally, completely openly and did not call for any kind of violence. He conducted himself in a provocational manner, compromising his comrades who trusted him. When this "assistant" did not receive the pay he was promised (a separate apartment), in a condition of temporary insanity he committed a senseless murder of the apartment manager. Then he wrote a long "confession," apparently revealing those to whom he brought his information, and hanged himself. Incidentally, this "confession" was not shown to our correspondent in its entirety. Is the insertion of such people into public movements lawful?

[Ilyukhin] This is not a simple question, and we should not be utopians. Insertion is, if you wish, a type of intelligence. The state must defend itself and, as long as it exists, there will be special services carrying out the function of defense. They will insert people and study the mood. Yes, these days we are hearing talk about the elimination within the KGB of the directorate which is involved with preserving constitutional order. Let us suppose the elimination takes place. But I am convinced that another structure will appear to fulfill this function, which is so necessary for the time being.

[Gamayunov] But this is just where the opportunities for penetrating into personal lives, slander, libel, provocation, and revenge are unlimited.

[Ilyukhin] As a result it is so important to create an instrument that will block arbitrariness in this sphere. For this very reason we need a law on the KGB—a draft will be discussed in the Supreme Soviet. We need a law regulating this quite complicated and delicate work.

[Gamayunov] I cannot imagine how a law can regulate the activities of people who present themselves as someone other than who they are. These are people who have been inserted in the Christian Democratic movement and in the Social Democratic and other parties which take the stance of nonviolent transformation of society.

[Ilyukhin] But is it not possible to suppose that such parties may include groups of extremist persuasion where secret, explosive forces mature unknown even to the leaders of a particular party? Such an extremist wing can gradually prepare for the violent seizure of power and form armed detachments of fighters.

[Gamayunov] Is this kind of secret preparation possible in our times?

[Ilyukhin] Where there is a good conspiracy? Why not?

[Gamayunov] I must say that it is difficult for me to imagine such a thing at a time when we are moving toward an open society and toward parliamentary struggle for power.

[Ilyukhin] But we are still only on the road. And so that we do not slip and fall on this road, the security service must reveal the very first symptoms of preparation for the violent seizure of power.

[Gamayunov] It seems to me that this insertion of so-called assistants also conceals the possibility for one party to struggle against another using quite unparliamentary methods. In the Rostov story, that "assistant" was a typical provocateur. Everywhere he went he reviled the local powers in the name of the civil rights organization and cried out phrases like, "The Communists should be hanged." The leaders of Rostov then had the opportunity to encourage persecution of true civil rights defenders in the local press. Does such a system not give the ruling party the opportunity to deal with its political opponents in just such a manner?

[Ilyukhin] In my opinion, the example is not a typical one. And I expect that we would not be able to find even an attempt at bringing two parties into conflict in this manner in KGB operations today.

[Gamayunov] But it is impossible to exclude the possibility of such an attempt in the future. In your opinion, how could we secure our stormily evolving multiparty life from provocateurs? For this, should not the KGB be depoliticized?

[Ilyukhin] I have mixed feelings about depoliticization. Even if it occurred, imagine: Some party comes to power by parliamentary means. Its leaders, of course, name their confederates to important posts (and to the post of chairman of the KGB). Even if these leaders leave the party, they cannot stop thinking and, consequently, acting in accordance with their convictions. In such a case is it possible to guarantee that such a leader will not abuse power out of narrow party interests? I am convinced that we need other deterring mechanisms.

[Gamayunov] What kind?

[Ilyukhin] I believe that a provision should be written into the law on the KGB in a prominent position as a guarantee: "NO ACTIVITIES BY THE SPECIAL SERVICES IN PARLIAMENT AND ITS STRUCTURAL SUBUNITS ARE ALLOWED." The law should put the KGB UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE USSR SUPREME SOVIET. The law should clearly define the functions of the KGB as well as of its secret service agents. Such a procedure would allow them to ignore the instructions and decrees of the Council of Ministers, which for the most part used to regulate the activities of the KGB.

[Gamayunov] Viktor Ivanovich, thank you for the conversation, but it seems to me that some of your answers might be disputed in some respects. And our readers who are personally familiar with problems in the operations of the KGB will certainly also have their say. I expect that their opinion will be quite useful for our parliamentarians when it comes time to adopt a law on the KGB.

Soviets, Ispolkoms Functions, Roles Examined

PM1610151390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with Doctor of Economic Sciences V.S. Vilyamskiy, leader of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic State Planning Committee Central Economic Scientific Research Institute Rostov Laboratory, by own correspondent V. Ogurtsov in Rostov-na-Donu, date not given; under the rubric "The New Soviets' Problems:" "Chairmen Without Secretaries"]

[Text] [Ogurtsov] Vladimir Georgiyevich Chernobrivyy, electric welder at the "Don-25" Production Association, did not even mention salary when he was elected chairman of Khapry Rural Soviet by the soviet's session. Maybe such down-to-earth thoughts never even crossed his mind during the solemn moments of his elevation. Maybe he felt embarrassed in case he appeared "petty." That was the time when newspapers had explained in rather populist terms that it would be better if first secretaries of rayon, city, and oblast party committees were to be elected soviet chairmen. It was, moreover, self-evident that they would be performing their additional duties on a voluntary basis, without pay. When an electric welder was elected soviet chairman in Khapry, he was also expected to combine his production duties with the unaccustomed and quite complex public duties.

At the time, neither the soviet nor he himself had realized that this division was harmful not only to soviet work as such but also to the chairman himself, who was losing almost one-half of his salary as a result.

It was last June that the Congress of Russian People's Deputies altogether "buried" the combination of functions. It appeared that the only thing left to do was to set the chairman's salary somewhere within the established "bracket" ranging from 380 Rubles [R] to R430. Yes, everything appeared problem-free on paper... But there was not a single kopeck to be found. All the available money had already been allocated to Ispolkom [executive committee] Chairman Natalya Vladimirovna Blinchenko and Soviet Deputy Chairman Svetlana Vladimirovna Yereyskaya, who had dealt with all the paperwork as ispolkom secretary in the past and was forced to carry on dealing with it now. To somehow get the soviet chairman's salary together, it was even suggested to combine the two existing appropriations and divide the resulting amount in three. But this would have produced only R250 each, and the USSR Council of Ministers resolution no longer allows such low wages.

What is the way out of such a situation? I asked Doctor of Economic Sciences Vyacheslav Sergeyevich Vilyamskiy, leader of a scientific collective which is professionally engaged in organizing the work of local soviets—the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] State Planning Committee Central Economic Scientific Research Institute Rostov Laboratory, the only one in the republic, to comment on the situation.

[Vilyamskiy] Finally, local soviets have been joined by people who are not indifferent and are vitally interested in renewal; people capable of bringing new energy to organs of power with their views and action programs. But a few months have already passed, and the heated organizational arguments still rage unabated. The soviets and their ispolkoms are still busy dividing the duties, rights, and responsibilities of new offices, seeking ways to increase the apparatus numbers and the money available for salaries. In this situation, some of those elected and vested with power are beginning to hand in their resignations. Including soviet chairmen or, as in Vladivostok, entire city soviet ispolkoms.

In this regard, the situation in Khapry could be described as typical for local soviets at all levels. Here, as far as I know, there is also an inclination toward combining the offices of soviet chairman and ispolkom chairman. Therefore, someone ought to be relieved of duty: either Chernobrivyy or Blinchenko. There is hardly any need to mention the mental trauma this could inflict on both of them, regardless of which one benefits from such a reappointment...

I think that all this is due to the fact that recently adopted decisions have lacked adequate scientific substantiation. Starting with the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, which gave instructions that "as a rule, first secretaries of the corresponding party committees" should be nominated as soviet chairmen. This has failed the test of time. Even now, when many former "joint office holders" are switching to soviet work following the RSFSR Supreme Soviet decision, the party is still being reproached at rallies: It is supposedly using this method in an attempt to retain its former power. Let alone the 19th party conference's attempt to unilaterally regulate the basic guidelines of soviets' development.

[Ogurtsov] But I, for example, have repeatedly seen soviets and ispolkoms racking their brains, as the saying goes, over conflicting normative documents of recent times.

[Vilyamskiy] Unfortunately, the new resolutions by soviet power itself are at times indeed far from perfect. Take for example the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium resolution "On Provisional Regulations on Chairmen and Presidiums of RSFSR Local Soviets of People's Deputies" dated 9 February 1990. It is self-contradictory. Specifically, it first gives local soviets the right to ratify the soviet's structure by themselves, and then makes the reservation: "Proceeding from the following recommendations..." It goes on to list provisions which are totally unacceptable, especially for rural and settlement soviets. This is because eliminating the office of ispolkom secretary—who holds everything together in settlements, villages, auls, and kishlaks—would mean letting all soviet work just drift along. This is why the office of soviet chairman was introduced. Yes, we do have two chairmen and not a single secretary. True enough, the resolution does permit the additional institution of the office of one specialist on the rural soviet's strength. With an obvious hint that it should be occupied by the former secretary who (in exchange for a much lower salary!) will start serving the two chairman and the soviet and its ispolkom. Thus a casually executed stroke of the pen has, for some unknown reason, punished some 45,000—if I might use the expression—indigenous and sufficiently professional local soviet officials in the country as a whole.

In my view, another of the Presidium's instructions is equally arguable: On separating the soviet apparatus from the ispolkom apparatus and introducing the office of ispolkom administrator of affairs. When implementing this instruction, soviets are splitting what are already small departments and officials' functions and duties. The initial result is that the apparatus numbers are growing and relations between "former colleagues" are deteriorating before our very eyes. You know, there are even cases when they have ceased exchanging greetings when they meet on the soviet steps in the mornings!

As for defining the powers of the soviet, the soviet presidium, the ispolkom, and the ispolkom presidium, this remains an insoluble task for practitioners to this day. In my view, any division of labor between them would be theoretical, it would inevitably result in duplication and parallelism at work, and consequently in irresponsibility. I personally would describe as at least arguable the stipulation which insists that the office of

soviet chairman must be introduced instead of the office of chairman of the soviet presidium, which is the permanently functioning collective organ making decisions in the period between sessions.

[Ogurtsov] Some time earlier this year you admitted to me your doubts about the effectiveness of ispolkoms and that, if had your own way, you would abolish them. Could it be that they have rehabilitated themselves even slightly in your view since then?

[Vilyamskiy] Quite the opposite! Let us take our time and figure out how and by what means an ispolkom exercises its leadership. At kray and oblast level, it recruits its apparatus mainly from the main planning and economic administration, thus turning it into the basic apparatus of the ispolkom chairman and his deputies. Since these administrations (the future economic committees) are already tasked with planning, forecasting, coordination, and monitoring, their elimination would be detrimental to soviets' work. Therefore, the organs duplicating their functions end up being "superfluous." The ispolkoms in this case. In my view, they are unnecessary also because there is no longer any need for day-to-day leadership of enterprises: Now they should run their own operations by themselves. And management by economic methods—through taxes, prices, subsidies, and benefits—is the economic organ's direct concern.

Furthermore, the ispolkoms' departments and administrations have got accustomed over the years to applying ispolkom decisions to all the more or less important questions. In other words, shifting the onus of responsibility from themselves and onto the ispolkom itself.

Now it is necessary, first, to critically review the staffing of departments and administrations and, second, to restore their full autonomy in decisionmaking and their equally full responsibility for the consequences of decisions. Let them become the executive organs of the soviet's corresponding permanent commissions.

...As for the situation in Khapry Rural Soviet, my advice would be that it is better to abolish the office of ispolkom chairman and deputy soviet chairman and, in their place, to institute the offices of soviet presidium chairman and presidium secretary. The rural soviet presidium's structure could take the following form: chairman, permanent commission chairmen, chairmen of village social self-government committees, and presidium secretary. This would result in the creation of a permanently functioning soviet organ whose legislative cycle would cover the substantiation and adoption of decisions, while its executive cycle would encompass the joint work by all presidium members to implement their own decisions.

Soviets must be given in reality, rather than in words, the unconditional right to ratify their own organizational structures, without this right being infringed under any pretext whatsoever. For example, there are numerous soviets wishing to abolish the ispolkoms, especially at rural and settlement soviet level. But they are frankly afraid, since... the instructions being disseminated from above are addressed to the ispolkoms. Unfortunately, there is almost nothing to be learned from other countries' experience. For example, the 50 U.S. states have different organizational structures because they have different territorial conditions. It would be much more useful to select the optimal forms and methods of work through direct contacts with science, rather than awaiting guidance from above. Local soviets must be provided with complete packages of documents revealing the technology of the work of the soviet as a whole and of each individual official. This is indeed the "bureaucracy" which will make it possible to avoid fumbling and making fundamental mistakes in work. In principle, our laboratory is prepared to elaborate packages of normative documents on a contract basis. It is necessary to fundamentally reorganize the system for the training and retraining of soviet cadres. Including in the country's juridical faculties, which ought to increase the number of students admitted to all forms of training. And it would be better to transform the higher party schools into social management and law institutes.

All these proposals pursue a single goal—the creation of an effective mechanism for organizing the activity of soviets at all levels.

Academy of Sciences Publishes New Journal

LD2310180390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Interview with M.A. Manuilskiy, first deputy editor in chief of CHELOVEK, by T. Simonova; place and date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast under the rubric "Newspapers and Journals 1991"—recorded]

[Excerpt] [Simonova] The 140 journals published by the USSR Academy of Sciences were recently joined by a new one—the journal CHELOVEK [MAN], which has been put together in association with the All-Union Interdepartmental Center for Human Sciences.

[Manuilskiy] The aim of our journal is to try to help man ask himself certain questions, namely: Who are we? What are we living for? Where are we going?

[Simonova] The journal has come into being under the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Are you not afraid that your journal might turn into a dry academic pubication?

[Manuilskiy] Well, of course, such a danger does exist, but I should like to stress right away that this is an illustrated sociopolitical popular science journal. In other words we have no wish to take it into the realm of academic science. Rather we would like our pages to offer man the opportunity to get to know himself. [passage omitted]

Cultural Bimonthly Journal To Be Published

LD2510025190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 24 Oct 90

[Text] Goskompechati has issued a registration certificate for the AKADEMICHESKIYE IZVESTIYA journal. It will widely cover the activities of the USSR Academy of Creative Arts [Akademiya Tvorchestva SSSR] established last year. The academy unites distinguished scientists and figures of culture and art, including nine Nobel Prize laureates and real and honorary members of Soviet and foreign academies. AKADEMICHESKIYE IZVESTIYA will come out six times a year in Russian and English.

Gorbachev, Others Sign S.G. Lapin Obituary

PM1610092490 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Oct 90 Second Edition p 8

[S.G. Lapin obituary]

[Text] Sergey Georgiyevich Lapin, Hero of Socialist Labor, eminent state figure, and personal retiree of union status, has died in his 79th year.

The son of a worker, he began his working life early; the life of a journalist, diplomat, and major organizer.

Having graduated from the Leningrad Institute of Historical Linguistics, he was actively involved in press work in the thirties. During the Great Patriotic War S.G. Lapin was one of the top people in All-Union Radio. He made a significant contribution to the development of radio broadcasting in the postwar years as well. Between 1953 and 1967 S.G. Lapin was involved in diplomatic work. He was USSR ambassador to Austria and the PRC and worked as Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic foreign minister and USSR deputy foreign minister. In 1967 S.G. Lapin's life and activities became closely bound up with journalism again: Until 1970 he was head of TASS and then, for more than 15 years, of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting.

In this important post, during a difficult and contradictory period in our history, S.G. Lapin worked hard and indefatigably on the development of the country's radio broadcasting and television. It was during these years that the extensive program for retooling broadcasting, connected with the formation of multinational, multichannel radio and color television, was devised and implemented. Soviet television and radio acquired a worldwide reputation, became the country's leading genuine mass information media, and significantly enriched society's spiritual life.

S.G. Lapin put a great deal of effort into his duties as USSR Supreme Soviet deputy and member of the CPSU Central Committee.

S.G. Lapin was given the title of Hero of Socialist Labor for his services and received four Orders of Lenin and other state awards.

S.G. Lapin will be fondly remembered by all who knew him and worked with him.

M.S. Gorbachev, N.I. Ryzhkov, L.A. Voronin, A.S. Dzasokhov, L.P. Kravchenko, Yu.D. Maslyukov, M.F. Nenashev, Ye.M. Primakov, G.V. Semenova, E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, A.G. Kovalev, V.V. Yegorov, A.S. Plevako, P.N. Reshetov, A.P. Tupikin, and Zh.P. Fomina.

IZVESTIYA Reprints Ligachev U.S. Interview

WA2510143890

[Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 18 October in its Morning Edition on page 5 carries a 2,200-word "reprint" of Yegor Ligachev's interview with THE WASHINGTON POST which was published by THE WASHINGTON POST on 10 October.

Economic

Frolov Praises Communists' Efforts in Lipetsk

914D0015A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by PRAVDA correspondent V. Stepnov: "Work Creates Well-Being"]

[Text] **A. Teplenichev, party committee secretary of the Novolipetsk Metallurgical Combine and a member of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat, literally after the very first words of greeting, reported on a pleasant and honorable mission he had just completed—the presentation of party cards to young Communists. Yesterday there were five persons, and today there are eight. There is also the statement of the metallurgists in the combine's primary party organizations who have decided at this difficult time to tie their fate to the Communist Party.**

A frank conversation on the role and place of the party under new conditions was conducted at a meeting held with workers of the combine and readers of PRAVDA. I.T. Frolov, the editor in chief of the newspaper, shared his observations and findings with complete candor. He talked about the panic and despondency that have stricken many party organizations. Some Communists have become inactive. Some were offended by the numerous unfair attacks, and others were frightened by the threats of enemies of the party who had assumed power. Still others decided to show how poorly things will go without their participation. There are many reasons that explain the withdrawal of Communists from the resolution of political, social, and economic problems, but the result is the same everywhere—the collapse of the managerial structure, a lowering of the standard of living, and the acute condition in the provision of food products and commodities.

You can berate the state and collective farms as much as you want to, but the storehouses and the granaries will not be filled by resorting to expletives. I.T. Frolov said that material wealth is created by hard, honorable, and fruitful work. With appropriate respect, he assessed the aspirations of the party organization of the combine and its cementing influence on the collective. Here the Communists are not thinking of letting down and avoiding the resolution of many problems that are getting especially bad during the period of the transition to a market. PRAVDA has written many times in its pages about the economic activity of the combine.

They are not waiting at the combine for manna from heaven in the form of centralized investments, but they are developing a social infrastructure themselves on earned resources. A House of Bread was built here recently. Right on the territory. The entrancing smell of Russian hearth bread and crunchy long loaves of French bread now drifts over the industrial buildings. The metallurgical workers transfer a good part of the bakery goods to city stores.

However, a person does not live by bread alone—he also needs spiritual food. The video tapes that are now so very popular among the population will remain beyond the horizon of possibility for many people for many years, but the metallurgists are buying them now, and, within a year to a year and a half, everyone who desires one will have it. They themselves simply organized the accumulation of sets in short supply from blocs purchased in Japan. This year, they plan to issue 6,000 units, but they can issue up to 10,000. There are plans to organize the production of washing machines and refrigerators. And not the kind that are simpler and cheaper, but on the level of the world's best models. The metallurgists have set an important goal for themselves—to achieve a financial balance, which was disrupted in many industrial centers of the country: For one ruble of pay to produce goods for a ruble. This is the most reliable way to make the ruble healthier, to make it convertible, and to stop inflation.

I.T. Frolov's conversation with the metallurgists at the meeting, and on the following day with party and soviet workers of the oblast, ranged over the most diverse subjects. At times, critical and harsh questions were asked. For example, they asked about the kind of socialism that we built, what the time for specific actions means for Communists, what our political and economic prospects are for the near half year, and why the Central Committee does not give clear guidelines for local party organizations.

The answers of the PRAVDA editor in chief emphasized the need for Communists to display more independence and initiative, and not to wait for instructions from above, but to act in conformity with specific circumstances and tasks, and to orient actions on social well-being.

What is characteristic is that a majority of the Lipetsk Communists carry on in this way. They are asking, apparently, for a confirmation of their own convictions. Against a general backdrop of reduction in the country in the rates of economic development, Lipetsk residents remain at their achieved levels, and they are fulfilling plans for industrial and agricultural production and social development. Here, as everywhere, preparations are being made for work under market conditions, but, in addition, they are not sitting with folded arms, and they do not waste time on fruitless discussions and especially on strikes. On the contrary, they are mastering new forms of labor organization, and they are opening the doors wide for broad cooperation with foreign partners.

Several days ago in Lipetsk, the Soviet-Swedish-Brazilian enterprise "Progress" started production of natural juices. V.B. Donskikh, the first secretary of the oblast party committee, invited PRAVDA's editor in chief to visit it. With knowledge of the business, the oblast party leader explained the technological subtleties and details of concluding contracts with the firms, in that, also being the chairman of the oblast soviet, he actively promoted the establishment of the enterprise. The residents of Lipetsk assessed the product on its merits. The product is literally selling like hotcakes. The orange, apple, and carrot juices were tasty both to adults and to children. They are poured into practical and nice packages. What is also very important: The juices can be kept at normal room temperatures for up to nine months.

Next in line is to establish production of bicycles jointly with a German firm at a tractor plant, and Italian refrigerators at the metallurgical combine. There are contracts with foreign firms for the establishment of joint enterprises of the construction industry, and the food and processing industries. There is development in the output of general cattle-breeding housing and practical and comfortable cottages for villagers. The president of the country, M.S. Gorbachev, familiarized himself with the specific plans of the social and economic development and gave them high marks.

It is the Communists who are organizing all the good deeds and putting them into practice. It is they who roused the people to save the harvest. Today, up to 100,000 persons are gathering potatoes, carrots, beets, and apples in Lipetsk Oblast every day. Students and pupils are working today, and many establishments and organizations are closed. But, of course, it is difficult and uncomfortable to harvest vegetables from the soggy black earth in the rain and wind, but there is no other way to supply food products for oneself. Discussions about the advantages of a farmer economy will not add to our table, but Lipetsk Oblast has fully provided itself with vegetables, bread, and cereals. They will not live in poverty here in the winter.

The Lipetsk residents asked I.S. Frolov, PRAVDA's editor in chief, a lot of questions at the meetings about

the life of PRAVDA employees, and they expressed their wishes. The opinion was virtually unanimous about the need for a continuation of the policy on "debureaucratization" of the newspaper, for propaganda on interesting experience, and for coverage on people's labor. The metallurgists proposed adopting the experience of their high circulation newspaper, which introduced the rubric "Letters Without Deleted Lines."

The significant title says a lot in itself.

One of the most earnest desires of PRAVDA employees is to rebuff attacks on the party more boldly and energetically. Up until now, silence can be evaluated as evidence of virtue, but in time it can be interpreted as weakness.

It was justly said that before the beginning of the subscription campaign it was necessary to find means for subsidies for PRAVDA in order to maintain the former price and not to deprive those strata of the population with scanty means of the principal party newspaper. Now time has passed us by, and the support of friends of PRAVDA has to be counted on. The Lipetsk residents gave assurances that they do not intend to drop PRAVDA.

Sugar Refineries, Depots Full; Stores Empty

PM2610084990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1230 GMT 24 Oct 90

[Report by A. Kozhukhova; from the "Television News Service" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Sugar demand is booming in Moscow, despite the fact that up to 200 freightcars of sugar are reportedly arriving in the capital every day. Our correspondent reports:

[Kozhukhova] Not a day passes without requests coming in from Belgorod, Kursk, Penza, and Kuybyshev Oblasts and parts of the Ukraine and Moldavia: "Send us freightcars, sugar is being lost, there is nothing to ship it out in.

Meanwhile, hundreds of freightcars loaded with sugar are marooned on sidings at Moscow enterprises. Some of them have been laid up at the Moscow Smolenskaya freight depot, at Ochakovo, and at Moscow Paveletskaya freight depot since 5-14 October. Today 155 cars are standing idle. Yesterday not a single freightcar was unloaded. The upshot is a vicious circle—a glut at one end, and shortages at the other.

[Announcer] Despite everything, there is sugar in Moscow. Our correspondent was told at the Ministry of Railways that 20-tonne containers of sugar for the "Rote Front" and "Krasnyy Oktyabr" confectionery factories are waiting to be unloaded at the Yuzhnyy Port railroad junction. But the enterprises are in no hurry to collect them. Meanwhile there are mile-long waiting lines for sugar.

Tomsk Appliance Firm Raises Share Capital

PM2610100990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Aleksandr Solovyev under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Shares Bought Up Quickly"]

[Text] Tomsk—An open subscription for shares in the Household Electrical Goods Production Company ("BETI") has started in Tomsk.

The founders of the company, who created its primary material base, were the city soviet, production associations, and cooperative firms. The proposed authorized capital is 2 million rubles [R], half of which consists of the total number of shares allocated on open subscription.

Any inhabitant of Tomsk can buy shares (the nominal cost of one is R100). Many are in fact doing so: In five days, the subscription has "brought in" half a million. It is convenient and accessible in that it allows you to pay for only part, though not less than 30 percent, of the shares you are going to acquire. The intended size of dividends for next year is R20-25 for one share.

So that they are not all bought up by a narrow but rich circle of people and in order to guarantee democracy in the company, restrictions have been introduced: one person can sign up for shares worth a total of not more than R25,000 and enterprises or organizations—not more than R100,000.

The Tomsk inhabitants are not risking anything in buying shares: anyone can take back their investment at any time. The founders are not afraid of bankruptcy either: "BETI's" products—washing machines, electric motors, juicers, mixers, and other goods—are in high demand on the market.

New 'Impulse' Fire-Fighting Equipment Described

PM2510143390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1350 GMT 23 Oct 90

[From the "Scientific Herald" program]

[Text] Eliminating the consequences of accidents and disasters, fighting fires over a large area or in inaccessible zones—this is what this Impulse fire-fighting equipment can do.

Jets from fire hoses and foam extinguishers sometimes seem like pin pricks. The broad effect of this fire-extinguishing powder substance, capable of smothering flames and covering a large surface within seconds, is a completely different matter.

This is the IPU-54 model, based on a tank. You have just witnessed its field trials. The IPU-54 is an excellent example of the possibilities of conversion. It provides maximum protection for the crew coupled with the reliability and power of military hardware. The 40-barrel unit is capable of extinguishing up to 2,000 square

meters of flames without reloading. Speed of operation is between 200 and 400 square meters of flames per second, from a distance of 70 to 150 meters.

The seven-, nine-, and 25-barrel units mounted on gun platforms are highly maneuverable and make it possible to react flexibly to situations in disaster zones.

A multi-barrel recoilless unit mounted on a hoist makes it possible to fight fires at levels of up to 30 meters from the ground.

A platform suspended from a helicopter makes it possible to fight fires in inaccessible zones from the air.

Stationary units installed on ships, in aircraft hangars, and on oil and gas extraction platforms will guarantee their fire safety.

The Impulse systems can be successfully used to decontaminate light and thermal shields [dezaktivatsiya svetoi teplozashchity] and to suppress explosions.

Scientific

Soviet, Foreign Journalists Visit Chelyabinsk-40

City 'Kept Secret' for 40 Years

PM2410160490 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 41, 9-15 Oct 90 pp 28-29

[Aleksandr Guber report: "Classified City. A Story of People Living Next Door to Uranium Mines"]

[Text] More than a hundred kilometres from Chelyabinsk and a little more from Sverdlovsk there is a city that cannot be found on any map.

In that city, plutonium used in the first Soviet atom bomb was procured. The city's industrial association Mayak (light-house) works mainly for defence. There are five reactors. Three have already been shut down, and a fourth is about to go out of operation. The last will work until November 1. Chelyabinsk-40 is on the track to conversion.

We Soviet journalists and our French colleagues representing an association of science journalists went there for the first time. When our bus left behind an impressive check point (nobody can get into the city without a special pass), we recalled with gratitude the press club of the Soviet Peace Committee which helped us arrange the trip.

The first thing that surprised us was that a city with a population exceeding 80,000 and huge industries have been kept secret from outsiders for four decades. A vast territory is surrounded by a barbed-wire fence. Security is still tight, and the city is virtually sealed off from everything beyond the perimeter fence.

At first sight, the reason for such measures is unclear. What kind of secrets can there be at a time when foreign journalists have been invited to see the place and receive frank answers almost to any questions? However, certain secrets seem to have remained. Some explain that the barbed wire is still there for that reason. However, it seems that the real cause is different. Chelyabinsk-40 and other such cities have their own life, whose standards have always been noticeably higher than elsewhere. Better housing, higher wages and salaries, better supply, no problems with childcare centres and all the rest. Local residents themselves want barbed wire to protect their well-being, or what is left of it today.

Better housing is not the sole reason

The latest developments have added to these quite natural considerations. In the wake of Chernobyl, various ecological movements have been gaining strength. Many of them are targeted against nuclear power itself, that is, against everything being done in Chelyabinsk-40 and the work of local experts. An opinion poll has found that at least nine in ten local residents are strongly in favour of nuclear power. They think that this branch of the power industry is the cleanest of all. This is so despite the fact that local people, unlike the rest of the Soviet Union's population, learned at once about the 1957 accident which left a long trace of radioactive contamination. Failures in the cooling system then led to the explosion of a storage containing nuclear wastes. There have been no accidents at the local reactors for over 40 years. The reactors are the same as those in Chernobyl, except that they are hidden underground.

People have been living all their lives and bringing up children near the site of the 1957 accident, and they are reluctant to go elsewhere. The whole affair is not as simple as it may seem. People working here are professionals who chose this job themselves. Professionals know what radiation is all about and how to avoid exposure to its harmful effects. Local doctors have been saying that the health of the population is no worse than that of the residents of non-nuclear cities. The skill of local work force is very high, not to mention discipline. People with a record of work in Chelyabinsk-40 easily get jobs in other industries. So the people living inside the perimeter fence are in no danger of unemployment. What they are reluctant to lose is the job they have been mastering all their life and the relative material prosperity. It's always difficult to start from scratch. The people I talked to put the housing problem first - it's impossible to get decent accommodation at a new place at once. Yet, I believe this is only one of the many factors that binds them to the place.

Mayak managers eagerly admit that the veil of secrecy, lack of authentic information, and in some cases even misinformation has proved harmful and led to an upsurge in anti-nuclear sentiments.

"We have kept quiet about 1957 for more than thirty years. Even when we did mention the subject, we referred to it as something insignificant. We either kept quiet or lied about Chernobyl too. The whole world

knew that there had been a disaster, that the reactor exploded, but we kept saying that it was just an ordinary breakdown. Nobody believes us now even if what we say is true. That's natural, and there's nobody to blame," says Gennadiy Romanov, chief of the experimental research station studying the effects of the 1957 accident. "This does not mean there are no indecent people in the anti-nuclear movement, those who are after selfish aims. But it is not they who have produced this situation, it is we ourselves.

Two hundred years to go

We travelled along the trace of the 1957 radioactive cloud. The trees, shrubs and grass are as green as usual. Vegetation recovered quickly and plants with hereditary defects are no longer in sight. Everything seems to have returned to normal. However, the meter showed that the high radiation level still makes the area uninhabitable. One can drive through that area with the necessary precautions, but cannot stay there long. Fortunately, that area was not densely populated - only a few villages had to be resettled. But who knows what would have happened if the wind had carried the cloud not in this direction, but to the city, as happened in Chernobyl.

All of the nearby villages are populated by Bashkirs, although this is part of the Chelyabinsk region and not the neighbouring Bashkir Autonomous Republic. The reason is that in the Stalinist era, such trifles" were just ignored. The villages that had to be resettled were Bashkir, too. This has added the nationalist element to the problem: Chelyabinsk-40 is mostly Russian, and the Bashkirs living next to the city experience to the full the effects of what their neighbours are doing. However, in fairness, it must be said that Mayak built good homes for all the evacuees.

The contaminated territory will remain uninhabitable for another 200 years. However, in its least-contaminated part, scientists have reclaimed vast black-soil areas. Vegetables from local farms are sold in Chelyabinsk-40 after strict control. We ate them.

Isolation from the rest of the world has done no good to the atomic cities. Built to last, they still look neglected and provincial. This is particularly deplorable if we bear in mind the high intellectual and professional level of most residents: Having nothing to compare their life with, local people are rather tolerant towards the legacy of the past others have been quick to get rid of. I mean so-called "visual" propaganda, for instance, such masterpieces as "The enemy is on the alert," "Each working minute is everybody's asset," or "Labour is the cause of honour, valour and heroism." Chelyabinsk-40 has an excellent, newly-repaired theatre which for some reason is called regional drama theatre, although it has nothing to do with the region whatsoever. The amazingly well-equipped theatre and childcare centre were empty when we visited them. I cannot imagine that it is possible to put a childcare centre in perfect order when, according to the director, children had played their minutes ago. Everything - the winter garden with singing birds, the sports grounds, the computer class and the swimming pool - everything looked virgin. Although all that was unmistakably built for children, there was some kind of show-off attitude about it, an attitude found everywhere before, and which has now survived only in special reserves.

Through an outsider's eye

In general, what made this trip to Chelyabinsk-40, Chernobyl and the town of Zheltyye Vody, the site of a uranium plant, most interesting to me was the reaction of the French and to the French in those places where people have so far seen foreigners only in the cinema.

The hosts regarded the very fact that foreign newsmen were visiting a classified city and the gates of classified plants were opening to them as something out of the ordinary. They definitely through that the guests had never seen anything like it and would be incredibly grateful in any case. As for gratitude, it was all true, but the hosts seem to have forgotten whom they were receiving.

Most of the Frenchmen are leading science observers from their country's biggest publications and news agencies. They have many times visited such facilities in France and other countries, which make no secret of them. So they didn't stop in admiration in front of a reactor or uranium mining complex. They had already seen all that. Besides, the knowhow is standard. In some cases, it can be a little better or a little worse - only experts can understand that. As for flaws in construction, poor maintenance, overstaffing and not very clean rooms at the nuclear power plant in Chernobyl, as well as outdated computers in Zheltyye Vody and lines in shops in Chelyabinsk-40, they were clear to the naked eye.

When we were already on the train back to Moscow, I compared my impressions with those of the French journalists.

Jean-Francois Augereau of Le Monde:

"What amazed me most is that normal life goes on inside that barbed wire fence - schools, hospitals and childcare centres are open. It's incredible that a city of 80,000 people can be hidden like that. I was also surprised at the carelessness with which the people reacted to the contamination of the environment with nuclear waste for so long. I'm impressed by the high professionalism of the experts and their desire to be frank, and I'm really sorry that many of them have lost their bearings and don't know where they can use their knowledge and experience."

Jean-Pierre Defait of L'Humanite: "I could never have imagined that you had secret cities that big. I could have never guessed that the catastrophe we all knew about as the Kyshtym disaster occurred in Chelyabinsk-40. I, too, felt the alarm of the nuclear experts who fear they may go jobless. It's a big surprise to me that in a city sealed off

from the rest of the world people can feel themselves to be in a privileged position".

Philippe Escande of the daily Les Echos:

"The total anarchy, which has affected the Soviet economy, has begun to get through to the closed cities. I believe that they are still heavily guarded, not because of their secrets, but in order to protect them from the effects of what is going on around them and the anger of the population. Chelyabinsk-40 and Chernobyl are the sites of major nuclear disasters, so that anger is easy to explain. What is still worse is that there is no certainty that tragedies will not be repeated. To our regret, we saw that part of the equipment was outdated, and order and discipline leave much to be desired".

Jean-Pierre Defait made one more comment:

"In Chernobyl, I felt strongly the uncertainty affecting the whole staff. First the Ukraine decides to close down the nuclear plant. Then the Centre demands that the plant should go on working. Which order is to be followed? That kind of uncertainty in the nuclear power industry can have far reaching effects."

I am ready to back each word of my French colleagues and their conclusion that such trips have become possible as a result of perestroika. They have visited the USSR on several occasions, but they have never met with that degree of openness and frankness. Neither has bonhomie ever before been so much in evidence.

Reactor To Decrease Operations

91UM0054A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Oct 90 First Edition p 2

[Article by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA special correspondent Colonel L. Nechayuk: "In the City Without a Name;" passages in italics published in box]

[Text] *To be more accurate, it has a strange name—Chelyabinsk-40. Long ago now, in November 1945, construction began on the first buildings of the new city, and in June 1948 the industrial uranium-graphite reactor designed to produce weapons-grade plutonium was brought on line. It was this reactor that provided the metal for the first Soviet atomic bomb....*

When the American nuclear weapons monopoly was finally broken, they thought that the dangerous "games with the atom" would come to an end. More than 40 years have elapsed since then, but the nuclear race has not been halted and there is no assurance that it will end within the foreseeable future. Is it any wonder that throughout all these years Chelyabinsk-40 has lived on, and even now is living under a special regime?

However, times are changing. Foreign specialists have visited this "top secret Soviet city," and a delegation of French journalists visited it recently. The trip was organized by the Soviet Peace Committee in cooperation with the USSR Ministry of Atomic Energy and Industry.

They flew into Chelyabinsk in the evening. Aleksandr Ivanovich Pishchepov, deputy director for procedures at the "Mayak" Production Association, and Yevgeniy Georgiyevich Ryzhkov, chief of the public relations group. They were both cordial and affable but noticeably perturbed. This was understandable: A year ago the very thought of such a meeting had entered no one's head.

The "Ikarusz" bus with the guests and the accompanying state automotive inspection vehicles threaded their way through the suburbs of Chelyabinsk and out onto the highway. Just over two hours of uneventful travel through the now darkened steppe brought us to a broad, well-lit square with squat buildings. Between the buildings, instead of gates there were things similar to turnstiles, only larger to admit automobiles, with trestle work on the sides, evidently to permit observation from above. The guard was mounted by soldiers of the Internal Troops. And although their appearance was by no means severe, one of the Frenchmen made a somber joke: "Colleagues, are you sure that we will be able to get out again?"...

And one involuntarily recalls that much in the life of the city and the fate of its inhabitants were at one time connected with the department of Beriya. It was he who was personally responsible to the leader for the development of the atomic bomb and he often visited this and other "atomic cities." While he understood nothing about physics or the technology in general, Beriya was his own power, and established what was described as fierce "secrecy," when a word out of place could cost a man his life.

That is all far in the past. And it is only the old-timers who remember that the present Victory Boulevard was at one time named Beriya Street, and that the arrival of the leader's companion-in-arms in the city was in a limousine captured as a war trophy, with its bullet-proof windows.

The people brought together by Beriya's department from all parts of the country put their hearts into their work for decades, and deserved the orders and rewards that they received, and recognized with pride that they were making weapons to defend the motherland. Children grew up and went away to their studies, and almost all of them returned to their old city behind the barbed wire and continued the business started by their grandfathers.

More than 80,000 people live in Chelyabinsk-40 today. Not counting construction workers and workers in the services sphere, most of the adult population works at the "Mayak" Production Association. It includes reactor, radiochemical, and radioisotope production facilities, and enterprises producing instruments and special (read "military") output.

The director of the association is Viktor Ilich Fetisov, who is also the chairman of the city soviet of people's deputies. Telling his guests about the production problems, he willy-nilly switches to social problems—the

relationship between people and complex equipment, and the city and its surroundings. I think that this is not only because they have always been particularly closely interwoven here. The knot of these problems is tightly drawn in this time of change for the country.

"In the past three years," Viktor Ilich says, "we have shut down three reactors, and in July of this year a fourth was shut down, and the fifth, the last, will come off line on 1 November. Energetic plutonium for peaceful uses will still be produced, but not weapons-grade plutonium."

"Does this mean that you will be shutting down the reactor plant which is so obsolete?" asks Philippe Eskand from the Paris economic newspaper LES ECHOS.

"No, it is quite up-to-date and the reactors are able to operate efficiently until 1995. There is simply a production cutback in accordance with the decisions of the country's leadership."

"How many people are employed in reactor production, and at the association in general?" Jean-Pierre Defe [name as transliterated] from L'HUMANITE wants to know.

"I fear that if I name the figure," Fetisov smiles, "you will interpret it incorrectly: How do we do it? You must all be Jacks-of-all-trades, you will think...."

"But I am really asking about how many people work on the reactors, not those who do sewing or reaping or play the flute." To the laughter of those present, the French journalist clarified what he meant.

"Well then, count them for yourself: Each shift at reactor needs 28 people, there are five shifts a day...." The director surrenders.

"You have been in the United States, and have no doubt been convinced that there are many problems connected with environmental pollution at factories producing plutonium. What is the position here?" asks Serzha Berga [name as transliterated], the oldest of the French scientific journalists.

"We have also been unable to avoid this, especially in the beginning when we had no experience," answers Fetisov. "but during these last decades all has been normal: There have been no leaks, no emissions. We are paying for our old sins: The Techa River and Lake Karachay have been contaminated with a considerable quantity of active substances, and an explosion at a waste storage facility in 1957 has also passed on its "legacy." We are now engaged in rehabilitating contaminated territories within a sanitation cordon. I think that we will return to a normal life."

The reactor plant is about 10 kilometers from the residential zone. Buildings and installations built in the style of the 1950's can be seen through the thick greenery of the trees. The most impressive of them, as high as a 10-story house, is a central reactor hall. A signboard is affixed to the wall at the entrance: "Second Series-Produced Energy Installation in the USSR. Brought on Line April 1951. Shut down July 1990."

It is like a gravestone. The reactor was "alive" for 39 years, and moreover without a single accident or serious shutdown. It was shut down only once for about two months in connection with its latest round of modernization. There were many of these, the last following the Chernobyl catastrophe. But originally the reactor was designed to operate only for five years. How did it achieve its longevity and—the main thing—its reliability?

"In contrast to the Chernobyl reactors, all of ours are located underground in concrete shafts," plant director Vitaliy Ivanovich Sadovnikov explains. "If the same had been done at Chernobyl and the same kind of accident had occurred, it would not have been so unfortunate. It was a senseless and incompetent desire to save money when building the Chernobyl nuclear power station that led to the tragedy. In general, any modern equipment, especially nuclear equipment, has stricter operating requirements and will not tolerate superficiality, irresponsibility, or lax discipline. Here this has been absolutely eliminated, and not only through the strict requirements made of organizational work but also through the entire tenor of life and the many years of tradition established by Igor Vasilyevich Kurchatov.

Although Vitaliy Ivanovich's opinion seems categorical, it can be believed. It has been carried through many years of personal experience, and indeed through his entire life, which has been an inseparable part of the destiny of Chelyabinsk-40. He has been here since 1947, since he was a child. His father built the first reactor and worked on it as an operator and a shift chief. So the director comes from a long line of nuclear people.

Space deprives me of the opportunity to describe the system used in training and study and in passing on experience and skills gained over the long years at the "Mayak" Association. Let me say merely that today the experts at Chelyabinsk-40 are without exaggeration the best in the business—aces, like test pilots in aviation. Only here their "aircraft" is doomed to stay on the ground.

We don special footwear and white coats and hats. We walk in the drizzling rain to see the "sleeping" reactor. A massive reinforced door filled with lead pellets leads into the central hall where the fuel used to be loaded into the core.

The hall is huge, rather like a testing and assembly building at a space launch center. In the middle of the hall there is a large circle set out like a tile pattern, with square metal plates.

This is the upper part of the reactor, its former active zone. As they say here, the "snout" [pyatak]—the zero mark—and all the equipment reaches deep into the ground to 53.3 meters.

The AV-2 uranium-graphite reactor that we are talking about is a vertical cylinder. Its center part is the core, lined with graphite bricks. The diameter of the masonry is 11.8 meters, its height 7.6 meters. It is evenly pierced with vertical apertures each with a diameter of 60 millimeters and spaced at a distance of 200 millimeters. In all there are 2,001 of the apertures, or cells, as the experts call them. And it is into these that the so-called assemblies are lowered—rods made from uranium-235 and uranium-238. Now they are empty, covered with the plates that rattle underfoot.

The neutrons emitted by the uranium-235 are repeatedly reflected by the graphite and lose energy until at about 5MEV the nucleus becomes uranium-238 and can absorb the neutrons and become plutonium. It takes several months to process a given amount of plutonium.

It is understood that during these processes strong radioactivity is given off, and it is necessary to protect personnel and the environment. This is how it was done with the AV-2. The active zone and its sides were protected by three layers: water and sand, each to a thickness of 1.5 meters, and a two-meter-thick concrete wall. Above, there was a layer of sand and bathite ore [batitovaya ruda] 1.5 meters thick and then a three-meter layer of concrete, and finally, a pool of water 1.5 meters deep. The result was that around the reactor the level of radioactivity was no greater than the background level.

We went through the entire premises and into all the nooks and crannies. It was like being on a ship that had been abandoned by its crew and made ready for scuttling. This was probably due to thinking about the crew. People who possess invaluable experience and the highest, although very specialized skills, now have nothing to do. Where are they now?

Vitaliy Ivanovich's answer was slow in coming.

"It was hoped that our specialists would make up the backbone of personnel at the South Ural nuclear power station and be able to work without having to move from their homes, passing on their knowledge, experience, and traditions to the new shift. Construction was halted and the hope was dashed. Some have tried to get jobs at existing nuclear power stations, but they are not used to this and there are complications—with apartments and living conditions. Conversion remains, and we will be seeking out new paths for tomorrow....

"The situation is very similar to that associated with the reductions in the Armed Forces, even though provisions or promises were made for officers and warrant officers with respect to some kind of social guarantees. But people who were in the Army and Navy now must depend on themselves."

"But perhaps your specialists could be sent abroad to work there in their profession?" This was seriously proposed by one of the French journalists.

"I do not think that things have gotten that bad." The director of the "Mayak" Association joined in. "Our plant is not the only reactor plant. Things should not be irreparable. Although it is difficult, conversion is taking place, and laws are also being drawn up on conversion and on nuclear power engineering. I think that they will alleviate things for us. And for anyone with a head on his shoulders the things already done offer some prospects."

When we departed we strolled round the streets of the city, which, I want to assure you, deserved its name. We found a museum devoted to Academician I.V. Kurchatov, the leader of our uranium project, as it was then called, the founder of Chelyabinsk-40. His monument stands in the center of town. We visited the city drama and puppet theater and a fanciful kindergarten called "The Pearl," and we stood on the banks of the Irtysh River, along which a broad park stretches. The clean and agreeable city, buried in greenery, was like an oasis among the villages and settlements around. How difficult it was to make it thus, how easy to make it into a commonplace rayon center.

Suspected Cholera Outbreak in Moscow Contained

PM2410184990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 90 p 1

[Ye. Zhirnov report: "Will There Be Cholera in Moscow?"]

[Text] At the end of last week a tourist returning from India asked for medical help at the capital's Kiev Railroad Station. The preliminary diagnosis is cholera.

What is happening today? We put that question to N. Shestopalov, Moscow's chief health inspector.

"All the tourists, with the exception of four in the Infectious Diseases Hospital, have been sent home," he said. "The cholera vibrio El Tor has been isolated from them and from the eight people in the group hospitalized in Bryansk. Around 100 people have been traced who came into contact with the vibrio carriers—they have been isolated and are under observation. Other tourists are also under observation in Bryansk."

The quarantine service assures us that there is no danger of a further outbreak of cholera.

Military

Voronin Notes Military Trade Prerogative

LD2610103790 Moscow TASS in English 0955 GMT 26 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Yelizarov]

[Text] Moscow October 26 TASS—"Trade in military equipment is the prerogative of the state and is done strictly within the framework of intergovernmental agreements and with the observance of international

standards," first Deputy Soviet Premier Lev Voronin told TASS. "No deviation is permissible here," he said.

The issue of the state monopoly on trading in arms emerged in connection with an article in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA newspaper two days ago. It alleged that several defence industry enterprises were given the green light to sell their output, specifically military equipment, abroad.

Indeed, an enterprise in the Sverdlovsk region, the Urals, did export aluminium, a strategic commodity, and spent part of the currency generated from the sale to purchase food, Voronin said. Another Sverdlovsk factory, which produces tanks, also asked to allow it to sell part of its output to purchase goods for its workers.

This demonstrates that some regional executives misunderstand the tasks and ways to implement military production conversion as well as to democratise foreign trade activity.

The government keeps under stringent control questions of the state regulation of conversion and trade in military equipment, Voronin emphasised.

Environmental Committee Protests Nuclear Test

LD2510224190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1910 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Statement by Nikolay Nikolayevich Vorontsov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Environmental Protection, at the 25 October Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Supreme Soviet session in Moscow; carried in the "RSFSR Supreme Soviet Diary" program—recorded]

[Text] You are probably aware from the media that yesterday's "Vremya" program announced that a nuclear weapon was exploded yesterday in Novaya Zemlya. The Soviet Union has not officially declared any moratorium, so strictly speaking there was no legal violation. In practice, however, for 11 months we have not conducted any nuclear weapons tests, neither in the Semipalatinsk test ground nor in the Novaya Zemlya test ground. You are aware that the local bodies of power in Arkhangelsk Oblast have protested against the conducting of tests in Novaya Zemlya.

I would like to state officially that the environmental protection bodies were not given advance notification of the nuclear weapon test under preparation, and that we consequently did not monitor the situation.

I would now like to say a few words about how this event appears at the international level. I hope that this test, so to speak.... [pauses] Well, according to the official report there was no significant increase above the background radiation level, though we know that as a result of a series of tests, Novaya Zemlya has been strongly affected. You know that the Greenpeace crew which came here in violation of our norms was not allowed through to Novaya Zemlya, though nonetheless, samples were taken away secretly, as it were, and revealed a substantial excess in the radiation level in Novaya Zemlya.

How must all this...[changes thought] The governments of the northern countries have appealed to us more than once to stop testing nuclear weapons in the northern-...[pauses] in Novaya Zemlya. We are, of course, bound by the fact that the United States continues its tests in Nevada. This is a fact. But it is also a fact that nuclear weapons are tested in the Nevada test ground with the consent of the local authorities of the State of Nevada. As for Novaya Zemlya, as far as I know, there has been no such consent on the part of the Arkhangelsk Oblast authorities, on the part of the Russian Parliament or the Russian Government.

Our cooperation with the northern countries is currently developing very successfully. I would like to inform the deputies that an agreement in principle has been reached on obtaining extremely favorable—virtually interest-free—credit from Finland and other northern countries to convert Pechenganikel combines into environmentally clean enterprises, and from there (?down). In other words, we're talking about investments of around $500,000 in our Murmansk Oblast. On Monday I am heading a Soviet delegation in Helsinki at a meeting with the environmental protection ministers, and also bankers, of the northern countries, to discuss the question of environmental assistance in connection with resolving the problems of the Baltic Sea and of the north. You can imagine how we will feel at this conference after this nuclear test.

Finally, I am fully convinced that yesterday's nuclear test is yet another blow by the military-industrial complex against our President Gorbachev. I do not envy Mikhail Sergeyevich, who in December will be presented with the Nobel Peace Prize—which he undoubtedly deserves—in Oslo. How will he look at that meeting after the tests. I think the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation should make a special statement on this matter. Thank you for your attention.

Norwegian Cited on Novya Zemlya Radiation Level

PM2410160190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Oct in Russian 90 p 1

[Report by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent A. Baranov: "Off the Scale"]

[Text] Copenhagen—Data about the "excessive" level of radiation in the region of Novaya Zemlya, obtained by activists of the international organization Greenpeace during a recent illegal landing on the Soviet archipelago and offered up to world public opinion as a sensation, are overestimated by a factor of 1,000. This was the statement of the Norwegian scientist Britt Salbu, an isotopes laboratory worker at the Norwegian Higher Agricultural School. Her expert analysis has shown that members of the Greenpeace landing team quite simply confused the units of measurement, making a calculation

in milliroentgens whereas in fact the radiation was registering on the microroentgen scale. The actual radiation level on Novaya Zemlya, where, as is well known, a Soviet nuclear test range is situated, proved to be surprisingly low, the Danish newspaper LAND OG FOLK notes, citing B. Salbu's statement.

Submarine Sinks on Way to Scrapyard

LD2510203790 Hamburg DPA in German 1955 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] Kiel/Gluecksburg (DPA)—A Soviet submarine has sunk in the western Baltic on its way to a scrapyard, a spokesman for the fleet command in Gluecksburg confirmed this evening in reply to an inquiry. The NDR (North German) local television "Schleswig-Holstein Magazine" in Kiel reported that the submarine sank. The scene of the accident is in international waters between the island of Ruegen and southern Sweden.

It is said that the Soviet Union was taking the submarine to a scrapyard, presumably in Spain, when it sank, the Navy spokesman reported. The ship, which is approximately 50 meters long and in the "Whiskey Class," had already been emptied and had neither weapons nor engines. But because the submarine is in a narrow shipping lane and is in the way, the Soviet Navy has to salvage the ship.

Black Sea Fleet Commander Interviewed on Troops

PM2510141190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Oct 90 First Edition p 2

["Mini-Interview" with Admiral M. Khronopulo, commander of the Black Sea Fleet; place and date not given: "Three Questions for the Commander"]

[Text] [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] What changes have there been in the life and activity of your troops due to military reform?

[Khronopulo] Since our state has adopted a defensive doctrine, this has generated a whole series of practical steps in our fleet too. A considerable number of new elements have appeared in operational, tactical, and combat training and there have also been changes in the organization and staff structure.

On the premise that the fleet is being cut back in the context of the Armed Forces cuts, the main stress is being placed on quality. There have been certain successes. The results of this summer's fleet exercise in conjunction with the troops of Odessa Military District, attended by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, are evidence of this. He gave a high assessment of the fleet's actions, and that is highly indicative.

In my view, the Navy lifestyle has changed appreciably. Service is becoming more democratic and the role of the public is being enhanced. Certification commissions are operating successfully in the Navy. Officers' meetings, meetings of ensigns and warrant officers, and enlisted men's meetings at military-construction detachments and other institutes have been generated by perestroyka.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] In your view, what should be the ultimate goal of the Armed Forces reform?

[Khronopulo] The main purpose of the USSR Armed Forces is to ensure the country's unfailing defense. This must, indeed, be the ultimate aim of the reform.

The country's Defense Council has formulated a concept for the structuring of our Armed Forces. Defense Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov expressed its essence with the following few words: They will be smaller, better Armed Forces.

I believe that we must create the optimum structure so that Armed Forces branches and troop categories will be compact, multi-purpose, and mobile. I believe that the Army and Navy should be staffed by a sensible combination of contract service and draft service.

The Armed Forces should only do their job—of enhancing professional skill—and not what they sometimes do—extraneous, sometimes thankless work.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] What, in your opinion, are the main obstacles preventing the profound transformations currently needed within the Army and Navy?

[Khronopulo] The first obstacle today is the unstable situation in the country, which does not allow forward planning of troop and naval forces' training.

Second, the exacerbation of nationalism in some Union republics. Decisions are being made to set up national armed forces, people are refusing to serve on other republics' territory, rejecting the draft, and so on. All this has an adverse effect on the quality of Army and Navy training.

I think that the decision to recall students from service was also hasty. The Army and Fleet were not prepared for this step. The result was that we unexpectedly found ourselves minus tens of thousands of experienced petty officers and NCO's.

In my opinion, some mass media do great damage to our common cause of restructuring the Armed Forces. In the pursuit of "juicy" unsubstantiated facts, individual journalists undermine Army and Navy foundations and drive a wedge between the Armed Forces and the people. With their shallow articles they help young people to lose their bearings, promote the stratification of society, and strike firm blows to the people's feelings.

I am convinced that all these and other obstacles will be removed with the adoption of the USSR Law on Defense. There will then be social protection for troops and real concern for and attention to them.

General Interviewed on Military Aid in Harvesting

LD2610093190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0319 GMT on 26 October carries a six-minute interview with Lieutenant General Anton Konanovich Nadolskiy, deputy chief of staff of land forces and chief of staff for vehicular battalions at the USSR Ministry of Defense, by Mayak military affairs correspondent Gennadiy Kolenov, on military participation in the harvest.

Nadolskiy states that this year 36,500 military vehicles, or 94 vehicular battalions, have been involved in the harvest, working for four months in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, and Kazakhstan. In the RSFSR 56 battalions are operating from Bryansk to Krasnoyarsk, including Amur oblast, and 19 vehicular battalions are in operation in Kazakhstan. They have forwarded more than 28 million tonnes of agricultural goods, more than half of which was grain.

The collective farms and state farms settle with the army according to state valuations. Up to one-third of the cost of the exercise is incurred in transporting the vehicular battalions from their posts on the periphery of the USSR.

The general stresses that this is not the Army's job, but that the condition of Soviet agriculture demands it and that those involved in street politics could have helped shift the bumper harvest as well.

Yazov Defends Need for Heroes' Club

LD2510153890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2015 GMT 24 Oct 90

[Report by unidentified correspondent featuring interview with USSR Defense Minister Marshal Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov at the founding meeting of the Heroes' Club in Moscow on 24 October; from the "Television News Service" program—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] If you, as a Hero of the Soviet Union, have the 25 ruble membership fee, you have the opportunity to join the Heroes' Club. The founding conference of the club took place today in Moscow. There were 400 heroes in the hall, mainly veterans of the Second World War. The club's second most important aim, as its draft rules say, should be a resolute struggle for truthful coverage in the Soviet mass media of the activities of the Armed Forces.

In his speech Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov seemed already to have started putting this into practice, awarding KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA the flattering epithet of wretched rag. Judging by the draft rules, it is KRASNAYA ZVEZDA and KRASNYY VOIN [RED SOLDIER] that are the standard for truthful journalism.

[Correspondent] Dmitriy Timofeyevich, you got applause in the hall for your remarks about the need to get together and fight. With whom will the heroes of the Soviet Union unite, and against what will they be fighting?

[Yazov] They gathered to form an association. It will obviously be easier for the heroes of the Soviet Union to tackle particular problems within an association. For example, to answer your last question, they are fighting for a victory monument to be built to the 50th anniversary of victory. We must fight, battle, petition.

[Correspondent] When I was in the hall, I heard from one of the heroes of the Soviet Union the idea that we are a bit late in founding this club by something like 30 years.

[Yazov] We could have had an association a long time ago, and this association could have been of some use to the heroes themselves, on the level of agitation and propaganda.

[Correspondent] The organizers of the conference tactfully passed over in silence the question of whether this will be a club with generals at its head. After all, the main founders are the Main Political Directorates of the Soviet Army and Navy. Or will it be a club where the main role is played by heroes from the ranks, who paid for their Gold Star with their blood? As for the attacks on the press, might we suggest a way out: Lay down arms. This is the way out that a truly heroic person would take.

Soviet Warships To Arrive in Vladivostok

91UM0054B Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Oct 90 First Edition p 3

[Statement by the USSR Ministry of Defense press center: "The Transit of Ships"]

[Text] As reported earlier, a detachment of ships of the USSR Navy made up of the missile cruiser "Chervona Ukraina" and the destroyer "Bystryy" continue their transit to the Pacific Fleet. The ships have crossed the Indian Ocean without going into the Persian Gulf. On 19-20 October the ships proceeded into the Straits of Malacca and will enter the South China Sea. The arrival of the detachment in Vladivostok is planned for early November.

Baltic Republics

Nordic Council Urges Cooperation With Baltics

Independence Supported

PM2510112190 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 20 Oct 90 p 10

[Report by Elisabeth Crona: "The Nordic Area Voices Support for Baltic Independence"]

[Text] Tallinn—The Nordic Council delegation had originally said "no" to a joint Nordic-Baltic communique after the visit by Nordic politicians to the Baltic region. But the Balts applied pressure and a communique was adopted yesterday.

[Riksdag delegation member] Karin Soder said "yes" when asked whether this communique supports the Balts' struggle for independence.

Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis made proposals for last-minute changes, but these were not adopted.

The joint communique from the Baltic region's three presidents—Arnold Ruutel, Anatolijs Gorbunovs, and Vytautas Landsbergis—and the Nordic parliamentarians states that this is the first official contact between the Nordic Council and the Baltic Council and as such is of the greatest importance.

One of the central passages in the communique states: "Cooperation between close neighbors—within the the framework of the Nordic Council and the Baltic Council, and with each individual Baltic state—will play an important role in promoting independence and peace in the area."

The communique then goes on to focus on concrete issues which the Nordic group wants to tackle, taking as examples the environment and culture:

Concrete cooperation "would lead to real results and could also facilitate democratization and guarantee human rights in the Baltic states."

The Baltic leaders' wish to become observers at the Nordic Council is also included in the communique.

In the 90-minute talks the Baltic representatives also asked about the view the group takes of a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area. The response was that the matter is raised at Council sessions from time to time, but that the Council does not discuss foreign and security policy.

Yesterday the Baltic Council held both internal talks and talks with the Nordic Council.

Unlike the Nordic Council the Baltic Council consists of the three presidents. They coordinate their maneuvers vis-a-vis Moscow, even though they have adopted different models in their declarations of independence. Estonians and Latvians stress the process of negotiation and a transition period on the road to becoming independent states. Lithuania considers that the discussions in Moscow are between two states.

But none of the Baltic leaders wants to be a member of a Russian delegation. Arnold Ruutel declared that he had said "no" to taking part in an important meeting on the environment in the region around the Baltic Sea in Helsinki 28 October, since he does not want to go to it as the leader of a Soviet republic.

"The negotiations with Moscow are blocked. They are not progressing quickly enough."

In his comments to Nordic journalists Estonian President Arnold Ruutel was more pessimistic than Lithuania's Vytautas Landsbergis. Ruutel made an appeal that those countries which have never accepted the annexation of the Baltic region should now indicate their political stance and in some way raise the question of the Baltic countries at the United Nations.

This would help to speed up the negotiations, he said.

Ruutel thanked Norway, Denmark, and Iceland in particular for their support at the United Nations.

And what about Sweden and Finland?

"Ingvar Carlsson has supported us in several speeches," Ruutel said. But he gave an evasive answer in response to a question about Foreign Minister Sten Andersson, who a year ago upset the Estonians by saying "no" when asked whether the Baltic region was under occupation.

Like the Latvians, the Estonians are not pressing particularly hard at present for diplomatic recognition from countries like Sweden. Ruutel said that the first step is, rather, for countries which have never recognized the occupation to emphatically reiterate their position.

Today Vytautas Landsbergis travels to Moscow to negotiate with a Soviet group led by Prime Minister Ryzhkov. The Lithuanians are engaged in separate negotiations, even though the three Baltic presidents hold consultations prior to their discussions with Moscow. Twice—this summer and this fall—all three have had joint meetings with President Gorbachev.

Observers Invited To Moscow Talks

PM2510091790 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 21 Oct 90 p 6

[Report by Sven Svensson: "Lithuania Invites Observers to Talks With the Soviet Union"]

[Text] Tallinn—Estonia and Latvia will take part as observers when Lithuania discusses its independence in Moscow. That was the result of the summit in the Estonian capital of Tallinn between the three Baltic presidents.

The meeting took place alongside the talks that the three Baltic presidents held with the seven-man Nordic Council delegation which has been traveling through the Baltic region for the last week to map out the possibilities of cooperation between the Nordic area and the Baltic republics.

The talks ended with a joint press conference in the House of Trade Unions in Tallinn and the three Baltic presidents—Vytautas Landsbergis of Lithuania, Anatolijs Gorbunovs of Latvia, and Arnold Ruutel of Estonia—sat in line on the podium together with the representatives of the Nordic Council.

The main speaker was Landsbergis, who was on his way to Moscow for talks with Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov. He announced that Lithuania had proposed that the other Baltic countries be present as observers at the talks on Lithuanian independence which are expected to get under way again at the end of the month.

The three Baltic presidents have twice met with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, but at present talks are only going on at expert level. The talks are also going very slowly.

There are three main questions on the agenda. These are the questions of military service for Baltic recruits, visas for the Baltic republics, and the keeping of the minutes from the talks with the Soviet Union.

Landsbergis gave an express warning to the Nordic countries not to assume, when entering into agreements with the Soviet Union, that these agreements will also apply automatically to the Baltic republics.

As a result of their Baltic region tour, the Nordic Council delegation agreed that they would eventually put forward eleven different members' proposals. The aim is to improve cooperation between the Nordic area and the Baltic region.

The cooperation proposals will be discussed at a meeting of the Nordic Council Presidium and the Nordic Council of Ministers in Copenhagen in December.

Cooperation covers the environment, health care, education, research, culture, press services, sister-city contacts, statistics and registration, telecommunications and other communications, information, and the exchange of information on democracy.

In the environmental field cooperation will cover technical equipment, the training of environmental experts, energy supplies and energy saving, and water and air purification.

Cooperation in the field of democracy will include the exchange of visits by parliamentary delegations, the principles governing the harmonization of Nordic legislation, and the workings of democracy at the local level.

Coverage of Lithuanian Supreme Council Session

LD2510214190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1430 GMT on 25 October begins to relay live the Supreme Council plenary evening session during which deputies debate the land taxation bill.

At 1514 GMT a bill on cooperative garages and horticulture communities is presented which is adopted by a majority. Deputy Sabutis announces that next week's plenary sittings should take place on 30 and 31 October because 1 November is a holiday. Discussions on next week's preliminary agenda take place.

Kazimiera Prunskiene then steps up to the rostrum. Continuing her report on economic reform delivered some time ago to the Supreme Council, she describes various parts of the government program which are still being prepared. They are to be published in the press. She says the government program must be amended and corrected all the time as is required by events which are taking place.

Prunskiene notes: "I wish to demonstrate by a separate example how certain things change literally within weeks. In formulating our stance on foreign policy and in the sphere of consolidating independence we used to stress as the main issue the signing of a bilateral treaty with the Soviet Union following negotiations. But with the strengthening of the international rear and the emergence of new possibilities, it may happen that the negotiations will become only an official legalization of international agreements. This idea has recently been viewed very favorably and with approval by foreign politicians. This is a different stage on the way of consolidating our independence than it was a month ago. I think one could find many such examples also in other sections of the government program."

Prunskiene is then questioned on ownership, restoration of property to former owners, and environmental protection.

Next, Lithuanian Finance Minister Romualdas Sikorskis reports on the budget. He says: "The fulfillment of the republic's budget is directly linked with its economic situation. The economic situation in the republic has not improved in nine months of this year. The situation in the republic was made very difficult not only by the critical economic situation but also by the economic blockade which started on 18 April and which lasted two and a half months, and its consequences are partially felt even now."

The minister states: "The blockade caused the deficit to increase by some 170 million rubles [R], and only R160 million were planned. I do not include here local budgets.

"The republican state budget's revenue plan in nine months of this year has been fulfilled only by 90.4 percent, or the revenue was almost R240 million below

plan. The total nine-month plan of the turnover tax was not fulfilled by R253 million. Thus, apart from my already mentioned R175 million which the Lithuanian state budget did not receive, the local budgets failed to receive R23 million, and the Soviet Union's budget did not receive R55 million.

"It is expected that this year the turnover tax will amount to about 2 billion, that is R375 or 400 million less than planned for this year. The profit payments by the enterprises under the republican administration were not fulfilled by R23 million. This happened because the enterprises failed their profit plans because of the blockade and for other reasons.

"The expenditure plan of the republican budget in the first nine months of this year was fulfilled by 91 percent, or the allocations were R205 million below plan. It is expected that this year the republic's budget revenue plan will be fulfilled by 91 percent, that is about R300 million fewer will be received than planned."

"According to a decision by the republic's government, the budget allocations to finance some expenditures were reduced by almost R180 million, and thus the deficit of the republic's budget at the end of this year should amount to about R370 or 400 million instead of the planned 160 million, that is more than R200 million more than planned."

At 1628 GMT, the deputy chairing the session appeals to deputies not to leave the hall because an "important decision is to be made." He notes: "At present I have a document that concerns us. We have received a resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers. Allow me to read its title and—to make it brief—in Russian: 'On the Transformation of the State Union Enterprises, Associations, and Organizations Located in the Territory of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Repulic [SSR] Into Joint Stock Companies.' This means the expropriation of these enterprises."

Deputy Abisala read the resolution: "Approve a proposal of the workers' collectives of the state Union enterprises, associations, and organizations located on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR on the transformation of these enterprises, associations, and organizations into joint stock companies. Establish that [word indistinct] stabilization of the economy in transforming the abovementioned enterprises, associations, and organizations into joint stock companies, the quota of shares of these joint stock companies belonging to the state must constitute not less than a half.

"Further, according to a decision of the bodies managing the state property the quota of the shares belonging to the state can be reduced by means of their complete redemption by the members of the workers' collectives, juridical persons, and citizens.

"Allow during the transformation of the state Union enterprises, associations, and organizations into joint stock companies, the sale of shares to the members of the workers' collectives on preferential terms.

"Determine (?temporarily) that until the fund of the USSR state property starts functioning, a government representative in the [words indistinct] the Lithuanian association of free enterpreteurs [words indistinct] entrusting to it, without the transition of the rights of ownership, functions of managing on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR the state property in industry, construction, rail transport, and agro-industrial complex, including the functions of the holder of the shares of joint stock companies belonging to the state.

"In order create more favorable conditions for effective work of the enterprises and its shareholders, support a proposal by the workers' collectives of the enterprises, associations, and organizations on the formation in the structure of the associations on the joint stock [word indistinct] of a financial insurance company with the aim of attracting foreign capital. Determine that the association can set up enterprises and organizations essential for its work on the territory of the USSR and also, in an established order, branches and representations abroad. The association and its participants make payments to the Union, republican, and local budgets being guided by the existing legislation. The state and (?foreign) economic commissions of the USSR Council of Ministers are to examine and decide issues [passage indistinct].

"Determine that the supply of the participants in the association with centrally distributed material and technical resources takes place in accordance with their obligations on work and deliveries to the state services, bearing in mind that the satisfaction of the requirements of production and capital construction [passage indistinct] on goods and services. [passage indistinct]

"The association takes part in the formation of the Union state reserves on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR.

"The organizing of joint stock companies not envisaged in this decision is regulated in accordance with the decision of the USSR Council of Ministers of [word indistinct] June 1990."

Abisala states that this decision is signed by Ryzhkov. He says that the Supreme Council should adopt a statement to the effect that such actions by the Soviet Union's Council of Ministers are illegal, and that the Lithuanian association of free entrepreneurs is an underground organization because it has not been legalized. This is debated.

At 1654 GMT a statement of the Supreme Council on the decision of the Soviet Council of Ministers is adopted unanimously. The statement is not read.

Landsbergis Meets Visiting Swedish Delegation

LD2510215790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2000 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] A government delegation from the Kingdom of Sweden, headed by Deputy Foreign Minister Michael Sohlman, is staying for the second day in Lithuania on an official working visit.

The delegation was received today by Vytautus Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania. Views were exchanged on the possibilities of developing cooperation between the two countries. Mutual satisfaction was expressed that the transition from good intentions to concrete deeds has taken place.

The head of the Swedish Government delegation addressed the session of the Supreme Council. He confirmed the resolve of his government to support the striving of Lithuania and of other Baltic states toward independence. Representatives of various Swedish ministries and departments worked in the groups of common interests with their Lithuanian colleagues.

In the afternoon, a news conference was arranged in the palace of the Lithuanian government. The head of the Swedish Government delegation, Michael Sohlman, a group of members of the delegation, and Lithuanian ministers participated in the news conference.

The Swedish Government delegation today concluded its stay in Lithuania.

'Sea Links' Discussed

LD2610090890 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Sweden and Lithuania confirmed their intentions to set up interest bureaus in Stockholm and Vilnius. Some Swedish sea ports would also like to discuss opportunities of opening direct sea links with the Lithuanian port of Klaipeda.

Such links would be welcome in Lithuania's only sea port because the Klaipeda harbor is only half busy, as it is regularly reported by the local press. Klaipeda experienced especially big losses during the Soviet economic blockade of Lithuania earlier this year, but even now the Soviet administration keeps sending a lot of ships from Klaipeda to other ports.

Following the unification of Germany the Klaipeda-Mukran railroad sea ferry is underused and often faltering, and the administration is exploring possible ways out for now and in the future. The huge two-deck ferries can accept up to a hundred railroad carriages, but at present they have been adjusted to taking trainloads, smaller goods trucks, refrigerator vans, and motor cars.

Bakatin Accuses Landsbergis of 'Delaying' Talks

LD2510191290 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] The Soviet interior minister, Vadim Bakatin, has criticized the Lithuanian parliament chairman, Vytautus Landsbergis, for delaying talks with the USSR.

Interviewed by an independent Lithuanian paper, RESPUBLIKA, he predicted that the three Baltic republics would refuse to sign the new Treaty of the Union. The interior minister denied that his subordinates would use force in this event. He spoke out against an economic blockade.

Landsbergis To Appear on Moscow TV Progrm

LD2510234190 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] Vytautas Landsbergis, Lithuanian Supreme Council chairman, left for Moscow today. We have no information now whether his trip is connected with the preparations for Lithuanian-Soviet talks, but it is certain that he has been invited to take part in a live Soviet TV program "Who is Who" tomorrow.

The political dialogue program at 1830 Moscow time [1530 GMT] is not during prime time. Still, millions of TV viewers will be watching it. So far Vytautas Landsbergis has had no chance to appear on Moscow Television and give a comprehensive talk on the restoration of the Republic of Lithuania.

Ryzhkov Discusses Lithuania-RSFSR Talks

91UN0126A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 23 Oct 90 p 2

[Article by S. Balyutskiy under the rubric "N.I. Ryzhkov's Meeting With Journalists": "Negotiations Will Begin in November"]

[Text] Moscow—The meeting was dedicated to the results of the consultations between delegations of the USSR and the Republic of Lithuania. The beginning of the meeting between N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the journalists was postponed for almost four hours. The negotiations had not been easy. The tired eyes of N.I. Ryzhkov and his deputy, V.Kh. Doguzhiyev, who arrived at the meeting directly after completion of the negotiations, were better testimony to this than any words.

Among a series of very important events that set the tone for the week, N.I. Ryzhkov had called for a second consultative meeting between the USSR delegation and the delegation of the Republic of Lithuania. Nikolay Ivanovich then began—not with the disagreements, but with an issue that they had succeeded in fully settling even before the beginning of official negotiations:

"We finally decided today that all privileges that exist in the Soviet Union for participants of the Great Patriotic War will be extended fully to veterans residing in Lithuania."

Later I asked Nikolay Ivanovich to return to this issue once more. It has become very heated lately in Lithuania, and people who have undergone the terrible experience of war have strong reactions to it. In response the prime minister quoted a phrase from the stenographic record of the meeting: "To take into consideration that Lithuania has resolved the question of increasing and paying pensions to participants of the Great Patriotic War."

The second thing that they managed to resolve at the meeting was the date—although only approximately—of the beginning of the first round of negotiations. Or more accurately, not the date but the period of time in which negotiations will be conducted.

"It has been agreed that negotiations will begin in the third ten-day period of November," reported N.I. Ryzhkov.

In addition, I will add on my own behalf that there is no longer any need to conduct additional consultative meetings. Only meetings of experts and working groups will take place before the beginning of negotiations. Thus, the starting point has been defined. But what about the starting conditions? They are more complicated.

The delegations did not succeed in coming to an agreement concerning the inclusion of representatives of Polish, Russian, and Belorussian national groups living in Lithuania in the negotiations as observers, as the USSR delegation proposed. Nor did the Lithuanian delegation accept a proposal to grant the status of observer to representatives of several of the republic's social movements.

Is it worth noting that they were talking in this case about people who for the most part do not agree with the strict course of the present leadership of Lithuania toward secession from the USSR? But can the Lithuanian Government's position on this issue be reconciled with the principles of democracy and glasnost that have already won themselves the right to exist in our country? Now the three or four representatives, without any right to a vote, will not be able to have any practical influence on the course of the negotiations themselves. They could have helped to reduce the tension in society and kept both parties from tendentious treatment of various subjects.

"We are not satisfied with the position of the Lithuanian delegation on this issue. We said to them directly that such behavior is unacceptable," declared N.I. Ryzhkov.

One more important issue has remained unresolved for the time being: How will Lithuania's national economic complex function in 1991? On what foundations will Lithuania's economic and trade ties with the Union be built? After a conversation with several participants in the first round of negotiations, I got the impression that the leadership of the USSR was more worried about this than the leadership of the Republic of Lithuania. N.I. Ryzhkov also confirmed these doubts as he answered a question from a TASS correspondent:

"To be honest, nothing is being done in this direction. We talked about economic ties back on 2 October and we advised them to resolve specific problems for 1991 as soon as possible. Twenty days have passed, and there has been no movement! We feel that the leadership of Lithuania is not very involved with the economy. But this is a question of the life of the people!"

"Nikolay Ivanovich," I asked, "there is a group of economists in Lithuania who believe—or so they say—that the republic can do without the Center by establishing only horizontal ties."

"The day before yesterday the Council of Ministers received a letter from K. Prunskiene informing us that Lithuania is going to be working along horizontal ties with twelve republics in addition to the Center. We answered, 'If you conclude agreements, we will not object.' Then Prunskiene put the question this way: 'Will the Union Government guarantee these agreements?' We said, 'No, in the event of default take the problem to an arbitration tribunal or a court of arbitration.'"

"Nonetheless, I understood that they are beginning to sober up," continued N.I. Ryzhkov. "It is necessary to develop horizontal ties. We are in favor of that! At the same time, intensive work will begin as soon as Monday or Tuesday with the Center on issues that can only be resolved with its help."

A paradoxical situation has arisen! The government of a "neighboring country"—that is the accepted way of referring to the USSR in Lithuania—is more concerned about the fate of a republic's economy and the fate of its people than its own government. Why is that? Perhaps it is growing clearer and clearer, as the prime minister of the Union stressed once more, that Lithuania cannot survive without the USSR's market. The leadership of the republic clearly understands this now.

So what is the goal of the negotiations—a new Union?

"Both the past meeting and today's meeting took place with the idea that there should not be any preliminary conditions," emphasized N.I. Ryzhkov, and continued his thought: "The negotiations are taking place to determine what the status of Lithuania will be. Will it secede from the Soviet Union? Will it remain a part of the Union? Or will it have a special position? Any variant is possible."

I do not know about others, but such an approach puts me in an optimistic mood. "Any variant" means that there will not be dictate or twisting of arms. It means that we can hope for responsive good will and trust.

Lithuania's Bickauskas Criticizes Ryzhkov Comments

LD2510163990 Moscow World Service in Russian 1030 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Excerpts of interview with Egidijus Bickauskas, Lithuanian permanent representative in Moscow, by INTERFAX correspondent Renat Abdulin; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] As has already been reported, the second consultative meeting between state delegations of the USSR and Lithuania took place in Moscow on Saturday. The sides exchanged opinions there on a wide-ranging circle of issues linked to the forthcoming talks. On the same day Nikolay Ryzhkov, the leader of the Soviet delegation and head of the Soviet Government, put forward his assessment of the results of the meeting on Central Television. Noting that progress had been achieved in certain aspects, Ryzhkov at the same time criticized the Lithuanian side quite sharply for, in his opinion, not hastening to begin the talks process. A correspondent of the independent Soviet information agency INTERFAX, Renat Abdulin, asked Egidijus Bickauskas, Lithuania's permanent representative in Moscow, to comment on Nikolay Ryzhkov's interview.

[Begin Bickauskas recording] I sincerely doubt that one could describe such an interview, in which acute elements prevailed, as correct—especially at the present time when careful preparations are taking place for talks. This will scarcely serve to bring the opinions of the sides closer together, and it is scarcely appropriate and permissable—as there existed the text of a report for the press, which had been prepared and coordinated by the sides. But a categorical accusation against the other side of allegedly delaying the start of the talks is generally unfounded, we believe.

Our position is extremely clear, and I think also consistent. For talks to be constructive, or for them to achieve results, it is essential to prepare for them carefully and define all these stipulations in the protocol on the start of talks—to define whether it is equal partners sitting before each other or a sovereign vassal—something that is quite unacceptable to us—and to define what the aim of these talks is. For without this, they lose all meaning. These are not special conditions, but simply a desire to counterbalance—be it only a little—those quite unequal conditions which were determined for us through forces 50 years ago, and which exist partially to this day. [end recording]

[Announcer] the INTERFAX correspondent wondered why the Lithuanian side was against the participation as observers in the talks of representatives of some groups from the Republic's population where there live in addition to Lithuanians also Poles, Russians, and Jews. Here is Egidijus Bickauskas' opinion:

[Begin Bickauskas recording] In the form in which this is demanded by the Soviet side it is unacceptable to us, of course. The delegations of both the Soviet Union and Lithuania are made up at the highest level of power, shall we say on both sides, and have the authority for this. I believe it is unacceptable to dictate to anyone else how to act. The working group has studied the issue of the participation of observers, and it found a mutually acceptable solution: that observers could be invited to the work of the groups of experts. Both sides of the working group agreed to this. We ourselves indisputably support the fact that the opinions of nationalities need to be considered, and as I have already said, the working group has found a possibility of how to consider this opinion. [end recording]

[Annnouncer] One of the most acute issues during the consultative meeting of the delegations of the USSR and Lithuania was the issue of the military call-up from the Republic. Egidijus Bickauskas noted that compromises were possible on this, too. However, we never agreed that the Union law on general compulsory military service should be implemented in Lithuania, he stressed. The delegations agreed that the official talks between Moscow and Vilnius should begin no later than the last ten days of November. In a recent interview with Lithuanian television, Romualdas Ozalas, the Republic's vice-premier, voiced the opinion that these talks would end with a recognition of Lithuania's independence no later than the first half of 1991. But what does Egidijus Bickauskas think about this?

[Begin Bickauskas recording] I have never been as optimistic as Mr. Ozalas has been in this case. I fear that these meetings have shown that the talks will be very difficult and very hard. It is not even that I am counting it out that in the end the Soviet side will recognize an independent Lithuanian Republic—with some intervals, shall we say. I do not doubt it, but I doubt whether this will be done in the first half of next year. [end recording]

Bickauskas Interviewed on Talks With Moscow

AU2610093590 Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG in German 20-21 Oct 90 p 4

[Interview with Egidius Bickauskas, permanent representative of Lithuania in Moscow, by Roland Heine; place and date not given: "Moscow and Vilnius—Not Like a Monarch and Its Vassal"]

[Text] [Heine] In May, two months after the declaration of Lithuania's sovereignty on 11 March, the Lithuanian parliament decided to suspend all steps to realize the independence "during the period of official bilateral talks." Quite some time elapsed until initial talks preparing the 2 October negotiations were held. Both sides are accusing each other of being responsible for this delay. Who has given in?

[Bickauskas] Both sides showed accommodation. We on our part lost our nervousness, and the Soviet attitude was influenced by the Western support for Lithuania and the internal development in the Soviet Union. The

existence of the USSR is at stake today. However, one must not assume that our views are identical now. Quite the contrary.

[Heine] What were the contents and the goal of the preliminary talks?

[Bickauskas] We discussed a timetable, the establishment of working groups, and basic issues concerning the procedure. We do not want negotiations between a sovereign state and a vassal, but talks on the basis of equal rights. This must also find its expression in the question of procedures.

Certain preconditions for the talks must be determined because we do not want to hold talks in an atmosphere of intimidation and blackmail, as was the case in the past. If Lithuania refrains from certain measures during negotiations, the other side must be prepared to adopt a similar attitude.

[Heine] After the second meeting on 11 October, Lithuania's Deputy Premier Ozolas spoke of "efforts on both side to reach a compromise." What are these efforts and what are their limits?

[Bickauskas] I am not authorized to provide detailed information on the state of negotiations. However, I would like to state that the desire can be felt among the majority of the delegation not to deepen the conflicts. The mere fact that no side tried to put the most difficult issues on the agenda testifies to the readiness not to block dialogue from the outset. However, the upcoming talks will be lengthy and complicated. In my view, Moscow's refusal to admit the crimes committed by Stalin in the sphere of foreign policy, particularly the annexation of the three Baltic republics, represents the greatest obstacle. In a situation where black is described as white and the other way round, the Lithuanian people can hardly be expected to believe in the sincerity of the Soviet side. A recognition of historic facts would help to find a common language. The last five decades would naturally have to be taken into consideration, in which Lithuania underwent numerous changes, such as in the sphere of infrastructure.

Union Treaty No Topic for Lithuania

[Heine] In Lithuania itself, the Prunskiene government is facing increasing pressure from radical nationalist forces, even within parliament. What impact could this have on the future development of talks with Moscow?

[Bickauskas] Yes, the government is under pressure, but not only from this side. However, I believe that this will hardly be of significance for a figure like Mrs. Prunskiene and that it will not seriously endanger negotiations.

However, it is high time for Moscow to stop urging Lithuania to sign the Union treaty. Every statement by the Soviet leadership in this respect will only lead to a further radicalization of the situation. This would ultimately lead to a direct conflict and might entail the use of military. It is quite obvious what this would mean for Moscow.

[Heine] An influential section of Lithuania's parliamentarians apparently believes that Vilnius should ignore the central government and hold bilateral talks with the individual republics. Parliamentary President Landsbergis, too, seems to favor this idea.

[Bickauskas] Personally I believe that these parliamentarians do not assess the processes that are under way in the Union in a realistic manner. I have been trying to make this clear in Vilnius for quite some time now, not without success as I have noted with pleasure. Talks are being held both with the central government and the republics.

[Heine] According to numerous observers, the ruling "Sajudis" are developing from a citizens' movement into a party. Voices are also increasing among the ranks of the founders, expressing concern that the country is developing into a party dictatorship. Mrs. Prunskiene stated that she does not want "Lithuania to become an authoritarian and dictatorial republic." Are such developments not harmful to Lithuania's foreign-policy situation and its international standing?

[Bickauskas] The old "Sajudis" fulfilled its task with the 11 March declaration of independence. I believe that it is important now to reorganize "Sajudis" as a citizens' movement in order to ensure independence and democracy. Despite various phenomena that also exist in other East European states, I do not see the danger today of Lithuania becoming a dictatorship. In the past five decades it was not possible to develop democratic traditions, and now there are all kinds of developments. Among other things, we are faced with an unveiled, absolutely unnecessary anti-communism. It is true that there are forces that want to create trouble, but in general developments are normal. Particularly the media of the central USSR government are exaggerating things.

[Heine] A new party law was recently adopted in Vilnius. According to this law, activities by "foreign" parties are banned in Lithuania. Will the Communist Party of Lithuania (CPSU) be banned?

[Bickauskas] What would happen to a party in Germany that is directly controlled by Moscow? If the organizational structure of this party would be rooted in Lithuania, this conflict would probably not exist. I believe that things will get even more complicated.

[Heine] In the spring there were reports that, in the event of Lithuania's final secession, Byelorussia would demand back the territories that Lithuania received in 1940. This question is now no longer so much discussed in public, but it has not been settled.

[Bickauskas] I do not believe that borders should be redrawn at this point. However, if further claims should

be made, negotiations must be held. Lithuania, on its part, does not claim additional territories.

Every Baltic Republic Has Its Own Problems

[Heine] The three Baltic republics are displaying a great deal of unity. Are their positions really identical?

[Bickauskas] Let me put it this way: As far as the question of independence is concerned, they are absolutely identical. There may be differences concerning the methods and tactics.

Every republic has its own problems. In Latvia and Estonia the percentage of the original population is much smaller than in our republic. But we have other problems.

[Heine] How realistic is the demand of the three states concerning participation in the Paris CSCE meeting in November on the basis of equal rights?

[Bickauskas] We believe that there is no doubt that we are entitled to participate in the meeting on the basis of equal rights. However, I am rather realistic and do not believe that the required consensus will be achieved on this. But we hope that the question will be raised so that the European states have to make clear where they stand. Maybe we will be allowed to participate as observers for the time being.

'Restrained' Lithuanian Paper Finds Readership

PM2510134190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Oct 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by Captain Second Rank V. Gromak under the "Direct Line" rubric: "New Publication—GOLOS LITVY"]

[Text] Vilnius—Residents in the Lithuanian capital cannot get accustomed to the new periodicals appearing at newspaper kiosks. As always some newspapers and journals are bought up right away while others spend a long time gathering dust in the windows. But the new sociopolitical weekly GOLOS LITVY found a readership right away.

I think that its popularity is due to a number of factors. The editorial council included such well-known people—in the republic and in the USSR—as I. Avizius, E. Vilkas, and J. Pozela. The newspaper is published in Russian, but is geared not only to the Russian-speaking minority in Lithuania but also to the inhabitants of Russia and other republics in the Union. The weekly's political tone is also appreciably different from other publications. It has less penetrating agitation, on the other hand a desire for a restrained objective analysis of events in the republic prevails.

Deputies Protest RSFSR-Estonia Draft Treaty

91UN0115A Tallinn MOLODEZH ESTONII in Russian 3 Oct 90 p 1

["Declaration in Connection with the Draft Treaty on Interstate Relations between the RSFSR and the Republic of Estonia"—MOLODEZH ESTONII headline]

[Text] On 2 October 1990 a special (closed) session of the Republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet took place and a draft treaty on interstate relations between the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and the Republic of Estonia was proposed for examination.

Lending great importance to this treaty and proceeding from the basic interests of our constituencies, which represent the non-Estonian population for the most part, we cannot agree with the procedure by which it was devised and examined.

Being deprived of the opportunity to take part through our representatives in the preparation of this draft of the treaty or in the coordination of positions as part of the official delegation, and in this manner deprived of the opportunity to express the vital interests of the non-Estonian population, not having had direct official meetings with the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] leadership, we do not consider it possible at the present time to take part in the discussion of this document.

Acknowledging our responsibility to the voters and considering ourselves authorized advocates of their will, the four deputies' groups of the Estonian Supreme Soviet have sent their own delegation to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet to conduct consultations and to coordinate mutual interests.

We propose that the Estonian Supreme Soviet refrain from adopting any rulings on this question before coordination of the positions of all interested parties is completed.

Adopted at a joint meeting of deputies' groups.

[Signed] P. Panfilov, chairman of "For Equal Rights"; A. Labasov, chairman of "Sotrudnichestvo"; L. Annus, chairman of "Communist Faction"; and P. Grigoryev, chairman of "Virumaa"
[Dated] Tallinn, 2 October 1990

Further Protestations Noted

91UN0115C Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 6 Oct 90 p 1

[Article by ETA correspondent A. Birov: "The Long Road of the Consultations"]

[Text] Moscow—**Will the consultations grow into negotiations?**

The latest meeting within the framework of consultations between groups of experts of the Supreme Soviets

of the Republic of Estonia and the USSR took place on 4 October in Moscow. At this meeting the Estonian side was represented by A. Kiris (the leader), K. Khallik, T. Kyabin, and A. Kuznetsov. The group from the USSR Supreme Soviet was headed by Yu. Tikhomirov and included workers of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Council of Ministers, the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education, and the USSR Supreme Soviet. Humanitarian problems and questions of culture, citizenship, migration, and a number of other subjects were discussed. The two sides agreed to meet on 16 October in order to discuss and coordinate the question of preparing a legal mechanism on citizenship and migration. In order to reach the consensus that everyone needs, Yu. Tikhomirov proposed that a scientific symposium be conducted to find the truth. Proposals were also made for a "roundtable," joint publication, etc.

During a lively discussion V. Kuptsov, chief of administration of the USSR Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education, noted that in Estonia "an abnormal situation has arisen which needs to be set right at once." The expert Baykov pointed out that "what is happening in Estonia and the many laws that are being adopted there contradict the USSR Constitution and the norms of international law." At this point Klara Khallik noted that "one might think these laws were never violated in the Soviet Union." During debates on the ethnic question Advig Kiris expressed the conviction that "for all practical purposes we do not have an ethnic problem, just a political one." The ethnic question is being skillfully used and raised by certain political forces who wish to gain political capital with it. In the exchange of opinions Yu. Tikhomirov asserted that we "do not have a scientific demographic policy." Responding to criticism of the draft laws on citizenship and migration, A. Kiris explained their essence and informed the other side of their basic provisions and goals. When someone argued that "we are hurrying," A. Kiris noted that "We really do not have any time.... We cannot postpone the resolution of economic and political problems for two to three years. At any cost we must at least create obstacles to a worsening of the situation in the republic." During the disputes K. Khallik also noted that, unfortunately, one could observe "a lack of understanding of the interests of the indigenous population and the danger of migrational flow from the Union to Estonia," which may have the most serious demographic consequences for the nation as a whole. K. Khallik said that she does not know "where else the ethnic environment has changed so greatly (by a factor of 24!) in 50 years." "Why should the Estonian nation sacrifice itself to the interests of the 300 million inhabitants of the Union?" (with regard to the migrational flow) asked K. Khallik. It was stated that "at present it is very difficult to find a way of achieving a consensus because of political opposition in the Republic of Estonia," that the center is "very concerned with the search for solutions and the situation existing in Estonia," and that "the more this process continues, the more the danger of destabilization of the situation in the country."

One would have to be a great optimist to suppose that the 16 October meeting is a fundamental turning point in the development of bilateral relations.

Estonia-RSFSR Independence Talks Continue

91UN0115B Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 28 Sep 90 p 3

[Article by A. Birov, press attache of the Estonian permanent representation in Moscow: "Independence Within the Framework of Unity?"]

[Text] Yesterday on 27 September consultations were continued with the idea of preparing for negotiations on the question of the restoration of Estonia's state independence. As you know, negotiations between delegations of the Supreme Soviets of the USSR and the Republic of Estonia were halted because the Union delegation only had authorization to conduct consultations, not negotiations. As a result, work continues by mutual agreement within the framework of groups of experts in the form of consultations.

Eight experts of the USSR Supreme Soviet took part in the latest such meeting, including Yuriy Tikhomirov, the leader of the group and deputy director of the Institute of Soviet State Development and Legislation, and Vitaliy Doguzhiyev, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. There were also four experts from the Estonian side: Advig Kiris, Hindrek Meri, Klara Khallik, and Rein Otsason.

The experts devoted much of their attention to questions of property; economic, financial, and trade relations; and the future economic structure and division of property on the Republic of Estonia's path to independence and state autonomy.

The main difference in the positions of the sides was that the Estonian party is proposing that the question of the division of property be decided according to the existing territorial divisions using the following principle: The property of the Republic of Estonia is all that property which is on its territory, and the Republic of Estonia does not aspire to its share of all-Union property. The representatives of the USSR Supreme Soviet have not agreed with this and believe that the everyone should wait for the final version of the program for the transition to a market and the plan for a new Union treaty—and only afterward return anew to the aforementioned issues.

Despite several fundamental differences in their approaches to viewing the problems, the two sides have stated that at present there is a need to continue the revision of economic questions and relations for 1991 inasmuch as the devising of final agreements and a draft

treaty will still take a certain amount of time and the current questions which determine the daily life of the people, especially economic ones, cannot wait. The second important issue which attracted the attention of the Estonian delegation was that in the event of "divorce proceedings" it will be possible to be guided by a law on secession "or something else" that "the Estonian side proposes," as it was put by a representative of the USSR Supreme Soviet. (We note that the consultations are being conducted without a record or a stenographer, and as a result the statements of its participants do not have legal force.)

It is characteristic of this and previous meetings that representatives of the center are trying to lead the conversation around to the new Union treaty, its advantages, and the need to take part in its preparation as well as in the economic program for the transition to a market. In connection with this, Klara Khallik noted that attempts to "link the questions of economic reform with those of political reform" are increasingly apparent at the Union session. Incidentally, the very same tendency was observed at negotiations between delegations of the RSFSR and the Republic of Estonia which also took place that day and in which Endel Lippmaa, Marju Lauristin, and Advig Kiris took place from the Republic of Estonia. And at a meeting on the 26th between the prime ministers of the Republic of Estonia and Russia, E. Savisaar and I. Silayev, the latter stressed that conclusion of an economic treaty is directly dependent on a political agreement.

The position of the USSR Supreme Soviet was very clearly stated by a representative of the USSR Council of Ministers, who said that the country's government will never settle for the disintegration of the Union. A. Kiris responded that "we see ourselves as an independent state." This probably comprises the basic stumbling block in the development of bilateral relations.

The parties will determine the date of the next meeting according to standard procedure. The subject will be humanitarian relations and the rights of citizens.

Estonian Communist Party Membership Figures Noted

91UN0115D Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 27 Sep 90 p 1

[Estonian Communist Party Central Committee press center report: "Who Is in the Estonian Communist Party?—E.-A. Sillari's Meeting With Party Secretaries"]

[Text] On 25 September there was a meeting between E.A. Sillari, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, and the secretaries of party organizations of Communists registered in the independent Estonian Communist Party.

E.-A. Sillari informed the party secretaries about issues concerning the transition to a market economy which were examined at a meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. On the basis of the Shatalin draft, one may presume that 12 Union republics will join an economic union. At present the governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia do not intend to join it.

A lively discussion took place, in the course of which the following questions were posed:

Is power in the hands of the Politburo as it used to be?

Proceeding from principles of the separation of party and power, the Politburo has not adopted a ruling in relation to the market economy. At the level of the republics the situation is very different. In a number of the republics, it seems that power is still in the hands of the party bureaucracy. The multiparty system is not proceeding at the same pace everywhere. Undoubtedly the Politburo no longer possesses power in its previous form.

What is the membership of the Estonian Communist Party right now?

By September a little more than 5,000 Communists had registered in the independent Communist Party, 20 percent of whom are representatives of the nonindigenous nationality. Over eight months 43,000 people left the party, including 30,000 Estonians. It seems that today the number of non-Estonians leaving the party is growing. In all, there are presently 63,000 Communists in the republic, of which 27 percent are Estonians. Of the total number, 20,000 have practically lost contact with the party. That is the current disposition of forces in the party. Of course the figures are rounded and approximate.

Who belongs to the commissions for preparations for the congress?

At present the nucleus of the commissions is formed from the secretaries of the party organizations and Communists and members of the Central Committee belonging to the coalition.

The Central Committee was criticized because the commissions are made up of too narrow a circle of people, and as a result the drafts of documents which are being prepared often do not live up to expectations.

A discussion took place concerning questions of preparation and organization of the congress and concerning the dates it will be conducted. It was considered necessary to carefully analyze the political and economic situation in the republic and the party at the upcoming plenum of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee in October and then to conduct an assembly of Communists registered in the Estonian Communist Party in Tallinn and the regions in order to discuss as broadly as possible the activities and tasks of the local organizations and Central Committee as well as the question of conducting the congress.

The opinion was expressed that the so-called transition period and coalition activities cannot continue for very long.

Those who had assembled decided to conduct similar meetings regularly.

Latvian Supreme Soviet Decisions Reported

PM2610085990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Latvian Parliament's Decisions"]

[Text] Riga, 24 Oct—Considering that the center is failing to satisfy many of the republic's financial demands, the Latvian Supreme Soviet deputies decided to find new sources to swell the republic's budget for themselves.

A law was adopted virtually without debate whereby deductions from all-Union state turnover tax and income tax from the population goes entirely into the republic's coffers. The same law stipulates that deductions from revenue connected with the sale of the 1982 state prize loan and from payments into the budget from the total sum of the profits of enterprises and organizations of union jurisdiction will be 57.5 percent of the total.

And the previous day the Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution "On USSR People's Deputies From the Latvian Republic." This document stresses that "USSR people's deputies from Latvia can act on behalf of the Latvian republic only with powers granted them by the Latvian republic's Supreme Soviet" and their activity can be supported only with USSR funds.

It is true that the republic's parliament does not use its decision to restrict the activity of the USSR people's deputies "when defending the interests of inhabitants of the Latvian republic unless this activity is connected with the deputy's work at posts in legislative organs and organs of management of the USSR." At the same time it has been established that "USSR people's deputies cannot simultaneously hold posts in organs of state power and management of the Latvian republic and the USSR."

As for the legal aspect of the matter, let the lawyers sort out the legal complications. But now A. Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, will have to renounce his place in the Council of the Federation while I. Bisher, first deputy chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, will have to leave his post as deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of Nationalities. It is true that to this day not one of the USSR people's deputies who are also people's deputies of the republic has renounced his powers.

Latvia's Godmanis Assesses Shevardnadze Meeting

LD2510134390 Riga International Service in Latvian 1830 GMT 24 Oct 90

[Text] As we reported yesterday, the head of government of the Republic of Latvia, Ivars Godmanis; Foreign Minister Janis Jurkans; leader of the Foreign Affairs Committee [as heard] of the Supreme Council, Mavriks Vulfsons; and the permanent representative of the Republic of Latvia Council of Ministers in Moscow, Janis Peters, met with USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. This meeting to discuss the further development of (?aspects) of the foreign policy of the Republic of Latvia occurred at the initiative of the Latvian side.

Ivars Godmanis, describing the course of the meeting, stressed that it took place in a friendly atmosphere, and the Latvian position was received with understanding. He described three main issues covered in the talks. The first was taking into account the close connection between internal and external political questions, as well as the USSR foreign minister's close involvement in the state structure of the USSR, about the future state status of Latvia. Namely, Eduard Shevardnadze has offered for discussion some sort of special status for Latvia within the framework of the new Union. The viewpoint of the Latvian side about such a possibility is of course closely linked to this being one possible stage on the path to Latvia's complete independence.

The second theme: Latvia's external political activities, especially in light of the approach of Helsinki Two discussions in mid-November in Paris. To what extent does the USSR Foreign (?Ministry) emphasize these, and how does (?it) assess them? The third block of questions, in Ivars Godmanis' view, is connected with already concrete forms of foreign political activity. For example in organizing information offices abroad, arranging visa matters, and the like. Ivars Godmanis emphasized that the USSR foreign minister's attitude was understanding.

RSFSR

Coverage of RSFSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings

24 Oct Session Reported

LD2410220690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1930 GMT on 24 October carries a recorded relay of proceedings at a session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Supreme Soviet held in Moscow. An announcer says that first on the agenda of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet today was the question of setting up a free economic zone in Maritime Kray.

Deputy Lukin talks of the desirability of this for the area, and of the role of ports in strengthening the republic's economy. He concludes his speech by pointing out ways to attract investment to the area, and various ways the state can help in encouraging enterprises there. The announcer states that the project had been previously examined by five committees, but various ammendments and addenda were proposed from the floor.

An unidentified deputy then expresses doubts on roles and responsibilities of various committees in regard to the budget for the zone. He is followed by Deputy

Lyubimov who talks of results adopting a draft law on setting up of free economic zone. He proposes a vote on this question. Deputy Stepankov supports the project, but says that foreign firms should be responsible for any damage they cause in accordance with Russian laws. Next, an unidentified deputy talks of the need for a port in Nakhodka. Finally Khasbulatov says that the draft should be adopted—it is with 153 in favor, six against.

At 1944 GMT, an unidentified deputy reads out a declaration on education and the shortcomings in this sector. Speaking on behalf of an unspecified trade union, he calls for an increase in spending on education in the RSFSR and for a system of guarantees for civil servants in the educational network, and urges the indexation of incomes in the sector. He says that money derived from the educational system should be plowed back in and not handed over to the government. There should be legal guarantees for trade union activities and rights. He says that representatives of the Supreme Soviet, the government, and the trade union should meet to reach an agreement and that there could be a warning strike in January 1991 if various demands are not met.

Rudkin, deputy chairman of the Committee on Legislation, presents the draft of a law on standing orders and calls for a vote on the various articles. The standing orders are approved by 93 votes in favor and none against, and then by 84 votes in favor and none against.

Deputy Goryacheva, who is in the chair, next introduces a debate on a draft law on agriculture. A speech on this is delivered by (Ustyuzhanin), first deputy minister of agriculture and foodstuffs. He talks about the revival of the rural areas of Russia and the development of the agro-industrial complex, noting the worldwide experience of legislation on agricultural issues, citing farming in Canada as an example. He says that the aim of the legislation is to remove state and industrial monopolies over agriculture and to give farmers more freedom. A package of laws on agricultural reform published in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA has the full support of agricultural workers in the republic, he contends. There are several safeguards intended to prevent speculation in agricultural land. The legislation envisages equality for all forms of ownership; the target is a mixed economy in agriculture. He goes on to say that the question of privatization and removal of state ownership occupies an important place in the legislation which addresses the question of how to create state foodstocks for feeding the population. He agrees with Yeltsin's suggestions to ensure that the inhabitants of urban centers will have sufficient meat.

After talking about the resources which have been invested in agriculture in previous years, he gives figures for the tax yield from farmers during the first 9 months of the year and reminds deputies that all social indicators in the countryside lag behind those in the towns, except for the death rate. There is no water supply, sanitation, etc. He emphasizes that money should be spent by the state on bringing the standard of living in the villages up to that of the towns. Despite speculation, there will be no famine in Russia this winter. He then asks deputies to approve the package of laws so that they can be studied in detail by commissions. This is done.

Deputy (Yugin), chairman of the Committee on Glasnost, presents a decision on the exclusive right of the RSFSR state administrative bodies to distribute pulp and paper products produced in the RSFSR. He talks about the shortage of paper in the Russian Federation and notes that central publications get the lion's share of paper produced in Russia, then calls for changes so that Russian publications get their share.

Deputy Vinogradova asks about the "catastrophic" shortage of paper for children's textbooks. Yugin answers this and other questions. Nizhniy Novgorod deputy (Yeltsov) asks about state orders for paper, questioning whether there should be a state order from Russia rather than from the center. Khasbulatov intervenes in the debate, explaining various points in the decision which is proposed for adoption. Yugin continues his explanation of the committee's position. Deputy Stepanov calls for the conservation of trees rather than paper. Other deputies make various points. The decision is passed by 171 votes in favor, with 15 against.

At 2014 GMT an unidentified deputy takes the rostrum to discuss a decision on the ratification of Soviet laws by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. He talks about the various amendments which have been proposed by a parliamentary commission, particularly about Articles Six and Seven of the proposed bill which deal with the question of arbitration in the event of dispute. A deputy asks if the Union treaty of 1922 is now being torn up. An unidentified deputy talks about the reference to the sacking of officials and the fines which can be levied. Khasbulatov intervenes at various times to keep the debate under control. A deputy complains that the sovereign rights of the RSFSR have not yet been defined. Another deputy calls for the removal of Article One, stating that the relevant clause in the original decision was phrased in the future tense.

The vote on Article One is 78 votes in favor and three against, and 72 votes in favor and two against. Voting on Article Seven is abandoned and then resumed—the result is 82 votes in favor and one against, and 78 votes in favor and one against. The clause is adopted. A vote on the decision as a whole follows voting is 82 in favor and three against and 77 in favor and three against. The decision is adopted. A vote on the draft follows. Deputy Titov proposes a revised wording for Article One. Khasbulatov appeals for calm and says that the amendment would cancel out the entire decision. The vote on the motion is defeated by 138 votes against 22. Deputy Rudkin says that the decision should include provision for possible penalties.

At 2027 GMT a vote on the decision on the validity of Soviet laws in the RSFSR is adopted by 168 votes in favor, with three against.

Appeals to USSR, Gorbachev

LD2510230290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2000 GMT 25 Oct 90

["Draft appeal" by a group of deputies to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Supreme Soviet in Moscow on 25 October to the USSR Supreme Soviet and president, read by unidentified deputy and introduced by R. Khasbulatov, chairman of the session; from the "RSFSR Supreme Soviet Diary"—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Khasbulatov] A whole group of deputies has proposed that an appeal be drawn up and sent to the Supreme Soviet, the president, and the highest bodies of state power of the Union republics. It has been handed out to you. What do you think? Are there some constructive initiatives here that we could adopt? I stress once again that we genuinely want to pursue our economic policy and carry out the will of the peoples of Russia by peaceful methods, and through accord. [passage omitted]

[Unidentified deputy] Draft appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR president, and the highest bodies of state power of the Union republics:

In the belief that the situation that has developed in the country is unacceptable for a civilized society, and that it is threatening to bring about a sharp drop in people's living standards along with economic and political chaos—and proceeding on the basis that it is necessary to achieve an immediate stabilization of the economy, a transition to the market, radical structural transformations, and the greatest possible social protection for the population—the RSFSR Supreme Soviet proposes that a mechanism for the joint coordination of plans and actions by the Supreme Soviets of the USSR and the RSFSR, the USSR president, and the highest bodies of state power of the Union republics, until such time as a Union treaty is passed, be worked out at the earliest opportunity.

To this end, direct talks should be held by 20 November 1990 between representative delegations. The topics to be discussed at such talks could be: Urgent matters having to do with a precise definition of the limits of the jurisdiction of Union and republican bodies; implementation of the program for a transition to new economic conditions; questions on the use and protection of property by state bodies; the defense of human rights in the transitional period; and the working out and strengthening of a mechanism for mutual backup in the operation of laws.

We believe that the creation of an interrepublican economic committee—involving all Union republics—could be a possible result of such talks. This committee would become a government of popular and national confidence capable of implementing the planned changes. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet places its hope in your political wisdom and sense of responsibility, and is ready to consider any proposals you may have.

Silayev Stresses Regions' Importance in Reforms

LD2510215390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] The transition to the market and cooperation between the Russian government and regions of the Republic was the subject of a conference held today at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers. Leaders of the RSFSR Council of Ministers and executive committees of kray and oblast soviets of people's deputies in Russia took part in it.

According to Silayev, chairman of the Republic's Council of Ministers, who opened the meeting, the success or failure of the Russian leadership depends entirely on the activities of local bodies of power. The participants in the meeting adopted a declaration supporting the consistent implementation of radical economic reform.

CPSU's Polozkov To Attend Bashkir Conference

LD2510210890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Report by Madriy Gafurov]

[Text] The third stage of the Bashkir Oblast party conference opened today in Ufa.

Ivan Kuzmich Polozkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party, arrived there to participate in this forum.

Our correspondent Madriy Gafurov reports:

[Gafurov] Conference participants will discuss the program of the Bashkir Oblast party organization in implementing the decisions of the 28th CPSU Congress and the founding congress of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation. The conference agenda also includes the issue on renaming the Bashkir Oblast organization republican. Delegates of the conference are naturally anxious to hear the speech and the position of the leader of the Russian communists on these and other topical problems.

Ivan Kuzmich today went straight from the airport to the oblast party committee where a talk with the party aktiv and Bashkirian people's deputies took place. There was a talk about a gap which had formed as a result of the destruction and dismantling of an administrative command system, when the new structure of managing the society and the national economy had not yet finished its formation. The topics of the day were: Party and Power, and Party and Soviets.

The main area of activities, it was stressed at this conference today, was the work in soviets because opposition to the CPSU force had formed, and it was united by a democratic movement.

Issues of cooperation with other parties and social formations were also raised at the meeting, as well as on the Russian press, on the structure of the central committee of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation, and on the Union Treaty. It seems that these issues, as well as more topical ones, will also be raised at the news conference scheduled at the Ufa town party committee.

Ivan Kuzmich Polozkov tomorrow will visit the mountainous area of Bashkiria. He will also visit (?Beloretsk), the town of Bashkir metallurgists; and Sibay, the town of Bashkir miners, where a meeting with secretaries of primary party organizations will take place.

RSFSR Finance Minister Views Economic Issues

914A0038A Moscow VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA in Russian 12 Oct 90 p 2

[Interview with RSFSR Minister of Finance B.G. Fedorov, by V. Chaava; place and date not given: "How To Treat Chronic Illnesses?"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] It is well known that the new government of Russia is one of the youngest in the country, not only in terms of length of existence but in terms of the age of the ministers also. People of the new generation, with new ideas, are coming to lead the republic. What is the view from the windows of their ministerial offices of the problems confronting the country and the republic? This was the subject of our interview with Boris Grigoryevich Fedorov, minister of finance of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic].

[Chaava] Boris Grigoryevich, you took your place in this office recently, but the country's illnesses are chronic ones which are, incidentally, engendering a mass of increasingly new ills. I will therefore begin with one of them: Surprising and gigantic figures of the country's state budget deficit were heard at the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session—340 billion rubles [R]. What does this mean?

[Fedorov] This figure emerged following certain rough estimates. My attitude? It is a financial catastrophe. We cannot live with such deficits. We have a deficit in the budget of the republics and for the country as a whole, what is more. In other words, given the prices which have been planned and given the programs which have been adopted, this is a financial catastrophe.

Incidentally, at a meeting in the president's office I inquired of both Pavlov, the country's finance minister, and Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin how they intend to finance the programs which have been adopted, but obtained no convincing answer. Once again emission; once again, consequently, it will be necessary to crawl to the banks. There is not that much left there. If we took R340 billion now, we would simply deprive ourselves of a banking system.

[Chaava] Tell us, have we come to the end of the line or are we already beyond it?

[Fedorov] We are on the way. Unless we now embark on reforms as quickly as possible, this will be the beginning of the end. Generally, the situation is extremely grim. To be honest, until recently I was in a more placid frame of mind. It was believed that our deficit was R60 billion. Generally R60 billion or somewhat more is also grim, of course. But would that it were such! This however is practically one-third of the GNP. Considering that our internal debt constitutes approximately R500 billion, it transpires that we have already borrowed the entire GNP. And we are being pushed further. Emergency measures are needed. We can no longer take the road we have taken previously.

To compare the two programs, the government program and that on which we are working, I believe the latter to be more realistic, conservative even in some respects. I refer in this case to the Gorbachev-Yeltsin program—it is called the Shatalin-Yavlinskiy program also. It has been supported by the Russian Legislature. It was worked on mainly by people with no connection with any dogma. Of course we did not start from scratch, time was logged, and we wrote the program within a month, in the main. There was a general desire to accelerate the program since there was no time to lose.

We attempted to show that the country must live within its means. This is obvious! We wished to show how the budget deficit should be financed. I believe that despite certain shortcomings of the program—there was a catastrophic lack of time—we managed to show that a normal economy exists; that it is possible to move away from the country-factory concept, where Comrade Ryzhkov is the manager, and to switch to economic policy; to attempt to accord the producer freedom where possible—and it is not that important what he is: private operator, state-owned enterprise, group of people, or collective—but that the state engage in economic regulation. After all, nothing has really been done so far in this sphere.

Now the draft itself has become "bogged down" in the Union legislature. I realize that for a whole number of particular reasons one common draft looks more attractive than a choice of two. But on certain key issues which are mutually exclusive I cannot see how they can be combined. This would once again be a short-lived palliative on whose behalf the draft is presented notwithstanding. The Gorbachev-Yeltsin agreement is what should be the foundation in this work. Nothing new will be created by 15 October, I do not believe.

We have already had some pseudo-reforms of the banks, and the results?

[Chaava] On the question of banks, incidentally. After all, the question of the creation of a Russian bank has been considered....

[Fedorov] My personal position is this: The country should have a uniform monetary and credit policy. If we are in a union, the system should consequently be uniform. Not everything that has been done in the Russian Legislature in this respect has always been sufficiently well thought out, it must be said. Mistakes have been made in some respects. But these are mistakes of growth. The main thing is that Russia has accomplished a most difficult assignment: It has started things moving.

Honor and praise to Yeltsin for having been able to turn things around. Whereas previously even talk about a banking system, one formed as a result of the agreement among banks of sovereign Union republics, was not taken seriously, this is now perceived as being perfectly normal. The reserve bank system in the United States operates exceptionally efficiently, incidentally. I would like to mention in this connection that there is in the Supreme Soviet a draft which reflects our ideas on this score.

I am personally amazed that the Union parliament is pretending that this alternative draft concerning a reserve system does not exist. In my opinion, this is explained by a misunderstanding of the political situation. After all, the enactment of a law in which the role of the republics is blunted will lead to further confrontation and new mistakes, of which so many have been made.

Many of our republics are currently headed in fact toward the collapse of monetary circulation, that is limits are being exceeded and major banks are coming to be abolished in places, which is not always justified from the viewpoint of budget fulfillment in cash terms.

The perception is that we are at times being engulfed by a kind of wave of pseudo-reforms, when we are dividing and monitoring instead of moving forward.

Generally I would like to stipulate that without a Union of republics it would be quite difficult for Russia to accomplish all the reforms alone. This would take many years, and we do not have them.

[Chaava] And what is your program as finance minister?

[Fedorov] Please understand, and not everyone is clearly aware of this unfortunately: the Ministry of Finance does not earn money. The Ministry of Finance does not even dispose of money. The Ministry of Finance is the custodian of state interests. Our job is to collect all the taxes entrusted to us by the state and to watch to ensure that expenditures are made on legitimate grounds and that they are efficient. We will fight those who spend money inefficiently. Naturally, we should suggest, frequently insist on what kind of taxes and what kind of expenditure there should be in the formation of the budget. I for example would never agree to the republic's R70 billion budget deficit. I will agree only to a budget which we know we can finance. But if it is decided to do this by way of emission, this is unacceptable right away.

[Chaava] And how would you formulate your credo as minister?

[Fedorov] My credo is to change some things in our country; to engage in economics, not talk about the economy; and to do something specific. I am for a pragmatic approach utilizing the whole wealth of economic thought.

[Chaava] Boris Grigoryevich, literally just before our meeting there were representatives of Austrian financial circles here, and after me, "next in line," Americans. Are you in direct contact with them?

[Fedorov] Certainly. These meetings are further useful for getting to know their problems in our market and becoming acquainted with their experience in connection with the impending privatization. They have done this in dozens of countries. They may seek our advice also. Our entire program will largely depend on how the world economic community treats us. If it helps, everything will be easier. However, if we have to get out of it ourselves, we will still implement the reform, but it will be more difficult for us. although I am a supporter of us orienting ourselves toward self-reliance, in the main.

Union Government Losing Support Among Russians

LD2310164490 Moscow World Service in Russian 1030 GMT 23 Oct 90

[INTERFAX report; from the "Soviet Chronicle" of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program]

[Text] The results of the latest public opinion poll shows that the USSR Government is losing support among the Russian population. Thus, 65 percent of Muscovites polled support the demands of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet for the dismissal of Nikolay Ryzhkov's cabinet. More than 80 percent in the small provincial town of Kimriy came out in favour of the dismissal. The inability of the Union government to put a brake on the economic crisis and inflation and to overcome the worsening shortage of foodstuffs have influence the poll results, in the sociologists' opinion.

Party Secretariat Condemns Democratic Russia

PM2510114390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "In the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat: Democracy Demands Responsibility"]

[Text] A sitting of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat discussed a report on the constituent congress of the "Democratic Russia" Movement held in Moscow 20-21 October. The congress was initiated by

the Moscow Voters' Association, the Democratic Party of Russia, the Social Democratic Party of the Russian Federation, the Democratic Platform, the Constitutional Democratic Party, the Peasants Party of Russia, the Party of Free Labor, the Russian Christian Democratic Movement, and other social organizations.

The constituent congress adopted the "Democratic Russia" Movement's statute and laid down procedures for constituting its leadership organs—Council of Representatives, Coordinating Council, and others. USSR People's Deputies A. Murashev, N. Travkin, I. Zaslavskiy, Yu. Boldyrev, and A. Obolenskiy; RSFSR People's Deputies L. Ponomarev, V. Lysenko, and S. Filatov; a series of local soviet deputies; E. Bonner, M. Shneyder, and V. Skrynnik; and others spoke during the congress debate.

One noteworthy point is the confrontational nature and orientation of the new organization, whose main task is to complete the "destructive operations" for the dismantling of existing sociopolitical structures including the resignation of the Gorbachev-Ryzhkov government; to remove the CPSU from the political arena and confiscate its property as well as the property of trade unions, the Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League], and other public organizations; to remove party officials from soviets; to achieve the "departyization" of the Army and the KGB; to organize civil disobedience actions like hunger strikes and general strikes; and to wreck the 7 November celebrations. No secret is made of the intention to destroy the USSR by taking the RSFSR out of it.

The "Democratic Russia" Movement's founding members most openly declared their intention to capture power by all means available to them.

In the conditions following the USSR Supreme Soviet's adoption of basic guidelines for the national economy's stabilization and for transition to a market economy and its appeal to all healthy forces for constructive civic accord, the organizers of "Democratic Russia" are whipping up moods of intolerance and dissidence in society, encouraging national isolationism and separatism, and calling for October's gains to be dismantled and for the country to return to a path of capitalist development.

This is fraught with a grave threat to our fatherland's future and the peoples' prosperity.

The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat resolutely condemns these manifestations of political extremism and civic irresponsibility. It expresses its confidence that party organizations and party committees, working people's associations, and the RSFSR's peoples will manage to resists the attempts to wreck the perestroyka processes and push the country into economic chaos and civil war.

There is no doubt the Communists and nonparty people, all who value peace and the fatherland's prosperity, will stand firm in the face of this latest provocation by forces hostile to socialism, striving to hold society back at a crucial stage.

Loyal to internationalist duty, the tasks of Russia's renewal, the country's extrication from the crisis, and the further development and improvement of political democracy, the Russian Federation's Communists stand against the social and national intolerance and political irresponsibility of those who, in pursuit of selfish goals, are prepared to push society into the morass of suffering and calamities. Consistently upholding the people's socialist choice and tirelessly defending the working people's interests, Communists call for the consolidation of all truly democratic forces and for civic peace and accord.

Russian Federation Calls For 'National Trust'

LD2510210790 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 25 Oct 90

[By TASS legislative correspondents Boris Zverev, Yuriy Kozmin, and Pavel Ostrov]

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS—The Russian Federation parliament today urged the Soviet Supreme Soviet, the national president and supreme bodies of state power in Union republics to hold talks in order to "clearly delineate terms of reference between Union and republican bodies in the implementation of the programme for the transition to new economic conditions."

The address, approved as the basis at the evening session of the Russian parliament, qualifies the situation in the country as "inadmissible for a civilised society, which threatens to cause a sharp decline in living standards, economic and political chaos."

In order "to stabilise the economy immediately" and ensure "the maximum possible social protection of the people," the Russian parliament proposed working out, as soon as possible, a mechanism to coordinate jointly plans and actions by the Supreme Soviets of the USSR, the Russian Federation, the president and supreme bodies of state power of Union republics prior to the passage of the Union treaty. To this end, it urges direct talks between representative delegations before November 20, 1990.

The Russian parliament believes that the possible outcome of such talks will be "the creation, with the participation of Union republics, of an inter-republican economic committee that must become a government of national trust capable of carrying out the proposed changes."

The address will be revised by the Presidium of the republican Supreme Soviet and made public later.

It has much in common with the recent speech by Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin, who called for a coalition government as one of the possible avenues

of action, following the national parliament's endorsement of the blueprint for market reform.

Moscow Railroad To Confiscate Unclaimed Goods

LD2310173290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] By a decision of the Moscow Soviet Executive Committee Presidium, from today new regulations are introduced in the capital's railways network. In accordance with these regulations, if goods are not reclaimed and not recovered within a month by the customer, they are confiscated and transferred to another organization which has an interest in them. Introducing this order, the Moscow City Executive Committee is trying somehow to influence the ministries and departments which are turning the railway into a warehouse on wheels. About 20,000 tonnes of national economy freight have accumulated on the approaches to the capital to date.

Social Democrats Open Sverdlovsk Party Congress

LD2510213190 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT 25 Oct 90

[By TASS special correspondents Lev Aksenov and Nadezhda Potapova]

[Text] Sverdlovsk October 25 TASS—The Second Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Party opened in this city in the South Urals today. Only 87 representatives of 46 local organisations have arrived out of 400 expected. During the three-day congress they will discuss a draft party policy statement and plans for its activity.

Political reports were heard at the opening session of the congress. They were presented by members of the party presidium and board Sergey Belozertsev, Aleksandr Obolenskiy, Oleg Rumiyantsev and Pavel Kudiyukin.

The Russian Social Democratic Party is one of the new political parties that emerged in the Russian Federation during perestroyka. Its founding congress was held in Moscow last May. Now the party has nearly 100 regional groups and primary cells with a total membership of 10,000.

The party favours dependable social guarantees during the transition to market relations. Its ideology is based on the principles of the socialist international, with which it has established firm links. Works to arrange contacts with kindred parties in other countries and Union republics is now under way.

Members of the party have been elected to the and Russian parliament and are active in local councils. Social democrats have formed a group in the USSR prliament and regularly voice the party's stance with relation to basic aspects of the country's life.

Russian social democratics were among the initiators of the Democratic Russia Movement, which was proclaimed in Moscow on October 22.

Social Democratic Party Presidium member Oleg Rumiyantsev told TASS that the congress in Sverdlovsk would discuss an array of draft documents, including programme theses, which he viewed as the most important document.

It analyses the path Russia has traversed in the 20th century, identifies social and economic tasks of Russian social democrats and sets out the party's view on its own place in the state and society.

"The congress will mark the transition from the unofficial small-group stage in the development of the party to its normal, mature party life, which is characterised by working out a party's programme for specific actions," Rumiyantsev said.

Private Newspaper Registered in Kuybyshev

LD2610092290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0200 GMT 26 Oct 90

[Text] A report from Kuybyshev: The first private newspaper in the oblast has been registered there. Its publisher is Sablukov, the chairman of the Isakly village soviet and correspondence student of the journalism faculty of the N.P.Ogarev Moscow State University. ISAKLYNSKIYE IZVESTIYA will be issued at the expense of the founder himself and sponsors. The editor considers that the publication will provide good competition for local papers.

Irkutsk Oblast Declares Independent Status

LD2610094290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 26 Oct 90

[Text] A declaration on the equality and independence of its territory within the Russian Federation [RSFSR] has been adopted by the Irkutsk Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies. Until an RSFSR federative treaty is signed, the oblast's exclusive right to own, use, and distribute land, its resources, forests, water, flora, and fauna is in force. Having declared the oblast an equal and independent subject of the RSFSR, the soviet established that RSFSR laws are valid on its territory.

Gorno-Altaysk Soviet Declares Independence

LD2510180290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] At the extraordinary session of the Gorno-Altaysk soviet of the people's deputies, declaration of state sovereignty was adopted today.

The oblast became the Gorno-Altaiskaya Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic.

It is stressed in the document that the ASSR is part of the Russian Federation and intends to develop its relations with it on the basis of federation treaty and Russian constitution.

Western Republics

Coverage of Crisis Situation in Gagauz Republic

Call to Arms Deplored

PM2510115190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 90 First Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent A. Pasechnik under the "Well, Well" rubric: "Holding a Match to the Fuse"]

[Text] Kishinev—A recent issue of the republic newspaper MOLDOVA SUVERANE (Sovereign Moldavia) carried an eye-catching appeal to all citizens of the republic and to President Snegur and Prime Minister Druk under the banner headline "Moldova in Danger!"

The appeal calls on "all people of good will to overcome political differences" and unite. What is the basis for this unity? I quote from the newspaper: "Fellow citizens, organize volunteer detachments in your local neighborhood or your place of work, be ready to defend Moldova's integrity and sovereignty...." There you have it.

Who then is summoning the republic's people to the barricades? The appeal is followed by a whole column of signatories including, for example, the organization of Democratic Youth of Moldova, the Women's Democratic Orthodox League, the People's Front, the Union of Writers and Journalists of the Republic, Workers of the Kishinev "Volna" Association, and quite a few other collectives.

...The office of the Union of Moldovan Journalists is directly opposite the correspondents' center where I work. Naturally I asked there first: "On whose behalf did you sign the appeal? Journalists have been coming from many editorial offices and expressing their indignation...." "Indeed, we are bewildered ourselves," they replied at the Union secretariat. "There has been no discussion of the document in our office."

...I rang the "Volna" trade union committee: "How was the appeal received with you?" "We only found out about it from the newspaper," was the curt reply.

Well, a familiar situation much used during the era of stagnation. The only question is: How does it tally with the new democratic principles of the restructuring of society now being widely proclaimed from many platforms both official and unofficial here? And the most important thing, I think, is this. Some people in Moldavia would very much like to further inflame an already explosive situation before the session of the republic's parliament which opens in a few days. To heed the appeal to create volunteer detachments is tantamount to lighting a fuse.

Moldavian Supreme Soviet Meets

LD2510154490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1343 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Report from Kishinev by Ivan Petkov—live]

[Text] I shall begin by saying that the appeal for dialogue and calm, considered actions has been voiced with alarm. Late yesterday evening a meeting ended between the president and government of Moldova with natives of the left bank, where the Dnestr republic has been proclaimed. Even today there is no shortage of such appeals on the republican radio and on television and in the newspapers. But whether this voice will be heard in the Dnestr basin, or whether it will be heard in the south, which has been declared the territory of the Gagauz republic, is difficult to say at present.

Today, as you have already reported, the Moldovan parliament has been urgently convened. Journalists, including us special correspondents, were not allowed in—it is a closed session. In any case, they said closed for at least the first hour of the session perhaps. The deputies—we already know this, news leaks out of course; we had known since yesterday—have gathered to discuss the matter of imposing a moratorium on the force of certain articles in the laws on languages and others, which have led to an extreme aggravation of interethnic relations, even to the territorial division of Moldova. If they adopt such a decision, a moratorium—they have, it seems, been negotiating at the session; that is what we have been told, perhaps something else will change—then the session will interrupt its work for three hours to notify the inhabitants of the Gagauz region and obtain a reply, regarding the moratorium.

This is the condition that is being made: they in their turn must also suspend their preparations and scrap the election of deputies to their parliament, which is slated for this Sunday. Otherwise measures will be taken to block the poll.

So of course, at this moment a great deal is being tackled. From Kishinev, I have seen for myself. I was walking here to the studio and across the road buses travel to the south, buses full of militiamen. It is clear that they are travelling to that region, the Gagauz region you could say, to take up their initial position to maintain order.

But in their turn, responding to an appeal from the People's Front and other public movements—it has been published in the press—similar buses are travelling there carrying vigilante units, vigilante detachments from Kishinev and many rayon centers. It is clear that this is not for the maintenance of order. Just now while I was on my way, there was a call in the next office from Komrat, the center of the Gagauz region. I spoke with people from the rayon soviet executive committee and they told me that there were no incidents in the town and everything seems to be calm.

Situation 'Under Control'

LD2510153490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1346 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Moshanu, chairman of the Moldova [Moldavia] Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, has informed deputies of what is being done to normalize the situation. He stressed in particular that the situation was under control. First deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, Khadyrke, has traveled to the southern rayons with a group of deputies. Moldovan Supreme Soviet Presidium member (?Kapanzhi), who is at the same time also a member of the provisional committee of the Gagauz republic, reported to members of parliament that the elections slated for 28 October had already been held in four villages in Komrat Rayon, noting that their results had been annulled. He did not explain however which organ had done this.

State of Emergency Considered

LD2510191190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1714 GMT 25 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondents Yuriy Pometov and Valeriy Demidetskiy]

[Text] Kishinev, 25 Oct (TASS)—The issue of declaring a state of emergency in the republic was considered at the extraordinary session of Moldova's [Moldavia] Supreme Soviet which began its work today.

The decision on this issue has not been adopted yet, whereas the interethnic tension in the south of the republic is heightened in the extreme.

Mircha Snegur, president of the Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], informed deputies about his conversation with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev on the phone. It was stressed that it is necessary to fight only through peaceful means to preserve the territorial integrity of the republic, rejecting violence and confrontation. After that the republic's president, together with a group of people's deputies, left for the south of the republic where elections to the "Supreme Soviet of the Gagauz Republic" started this morning.

As a representative of the national front of Moldova reported on national radio, approximately 60 buses carrying more than 3,000 volunteers left for the southern parts of the republic already. Another 80 buses are ready to depart from Kishinev.

Detachments of volunteers are being formed according to the decision of the government of the Moldova SSR "On the Formation of Voluntary Patrol of the Moldova SSR" from 23 October 1990. It says that patrols are being formed at "the request of public organizations, political movements, creative unions, and labor collectives to maintain public order and stabilize the sociopolitical situation."

Such detachments are made up mainly of young people. To avoid unforeseen situations and cases of arbitrariness, each detachment is being accompanied by a militia officer. The department of military issues in the republic of Moldova is supervising the creation and coordination of work of the detachments.

As V. Pushkash, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Moldova SSR, stated in his speech on the radio, the parliament arrived at the decision that political means directed at bringing the situation back to normal have not been exhausted yet. To realize this, the Gagauz leaders have to understand that the way they have chosen is ruinous. Otherwise the parliament will introduce the state of emergency in this region, Soviets will be dissolved, and a special form of government will be established. The republican parliament will have to set up a special committee which, during the stipulated period of time, will exercise full state power and management in the given region.

Army Role Examined

LD2510205290 Moscow TASS in English 1924 GMT 25 Oct 90

[By Moldova-Press-TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev October 25 TASS—The military council of the troops of the south-western direction believes that the situation, that emerged as a result of the proclamation of the Gagauz Republic, can and should be settled by peaceful means, Colonel-General Vladlen Kolesov, Moldavian people's deputy, said at an emergency session of the republican parliament in Kishinev today. He believes that the policy of confrontation has reached the limit of its resources.

"So far as the use of the Army in this situation is concerned, there is a clear instruction of the Soviet parliament (Supreme Soviet) on such occasions. It says that the task of the Armed Forces is to defend their motherland. All that deals with the establishment of law and order falls within the competence of the Interior Ministry and its troops," Kolesov said.

"Servicemen of the Soviet Army engage in planned military and political training. At present we are getting prepared for a military parade to mark the 73rd anniversary of the October Revolution".

Situation at 'Crisis Point'

PM2610134690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Oct 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent E. Kondratov: "Moldova: Tension Is Mounting"]

[Text] Kishinev—The situation in Moldova [Moldavia] has reached a crisis point.

On Wednesday evening demonstrations took place in the capital's streets, hundreds of young people were on the

march carrying slogans reading: "Moldovans take up arms!" Buses with volunteer militias are leaving for the South not just from Kishinev but from many other parts of the republic. For several hours the Supreme Soviet was discussing the situation in Komrat, Chadyr-Lunga, and Vulkaneshty, where despite everything, preparations for elections are continuing. On the previous day, a number of leading parliamentarians left for the area.

Reports from Komrat say that the Gagauz will remain adamant until their demands are satisfied—above all the demand for the right to self-determination. They insist on the revocation of the decision of the previous Moldova SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet session on the Gagauz issue, release from prison of their leader L. Dobrov, and discontinuance of criminal proceedings instituted by the prosecutor's office against members of the provisional committee of the republic which they have proclaimed.

It seems that they are prepared to travel to Kishinev for talks but are afraid that they would be arrested immediately.

On Thursday elections actually started in four villages in the South, but their results have been annulled by the provisional committee.

An emergency session of the Moldova Supreme Soviet began at 1400.

Situation Being Monitored

LD2610112990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 26 Oct 90

[Report from Kishinev by correspondent Ivan Petkov]

[Text] The Moldovan [Moldavian] Government is monitoring the difficult situation in the republic. During the night, subunits of the law enforcement agencies, concentrated on the main roads to the south, managed to forestall an attempt to break through to Komrat and other Gagauz villages by detachments organized at the call of the Popular Front and a number of other public organizations that intend to obstruct parliamentary elections in the so-called Gagauz Republic.

Nevertheless such elections did take place yesterday in some Gagauz villages, and today they are being held in the region's main center, the town of Komrat.

Early this morning, Moldovan people's deputies assembled at an extraordinary session on the difficult situation in the republic.

State of Emergency Declared

LD2610122490 Moscow TASS in English 1216 GMT 26 Oct 90

[Text] Kishinev October 26 TASS—The Moldavian Supreme Soviet today decided to impose a state of emergency for two months on southern Moldavia. The decision, taken at an extraordinary parliamentary session, applies to Vulkaneshtiy, Komrat and Chadyr-Lunga districts and several villages in Bessarabka district, which are inhabited mostly by Gagauz, the non-indigenous population of this republic in the southwest of the Soviet Union.

Only nine deputies voted against the move, with eight abstentions.

The decision provides for abolishing local governing councils and establishing a provisional committee to exercise full power in affected areas.

It also limits entry in and exit out of the region and bans rallies, assemblies and the use of duplicating equipment.

Parliament is also discussing the recall of volunteer units earlier sent to southern Moldavia.

It is planned to make Interior Ministry troops responsible for enforcing the state of emergency. Deputies intend to ask Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov to permit the use of a Kishinev-based Interior Ministry regiment for the purpose.

Further on State of Emergency

AU2610114490 Paris AFP in English 1135 GMT 26 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow, Oct 26 (AFP)—The Moldavian parliament declared a state of emergency in three southern regions of the republic where a Turkish minority began elections for an independent national assembly, the unofficial INTERFAX agency said.

The action by the ethnic Turkish Gagauz people was in defiance of a Moldavian government ban on the ballot, according to INTERFAX, a Radio Moscow publication.

The republic's parliament imposed the measure in a vote of 254 to nine, after two days of debate in special session.

They said it was adopted "after the Gagauz leaders refused to undertake negotiations".

The parliament started considering a state of emergency in the three districts, Chadyr-Lungski, Kimpatski and Vulkanechski, Thursday but broke off that evening without taking a vote.

Some 60 buses with 3,000 "volunteers" aboard headed Thursday for southern Moldavia where the Gagauz people are concentrated.

The volunteers were responding to a call by the nationalist Moldavian Popular Front to halt the elections. Ethnic Romanians are the majority group in Moldavia, which lies in the south-western part of the Soviet Union and borders Romania.

TASS news agency, meanwhile, said another 80 buses were ready to leave from the Moldavian capital of Kishinev.

Gagauz leaders on Wednesday appealed to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev for protection.

On Thursday morning major police reinforcements were deployed along the borders of the three districts where in August the Gagauz minority unilaterally declared the creation of a new republic.

There are about 150,000 Gagauz, who are orthodox Christians, in Moldavia. Elections for an independent national assembly were scheduled for Sunday but, in a last-minute switch, began on Thursday.

Snegur on State of Emergency

LD2610135590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1245 GMT 26 Oct 90

[Excerpt] Kishinev, 26 Oct (TASS)—[passage omitted] Mircha Snegur, president of Moldova [Moldavia], speaking today in the republic's legislature, announced the results of the visit he made together with people's deputies late in the evening of 25 October to the republic's southern rayons. He said in particular that they "did not manage to meet the leaders of the so-called Gagauz republic."

"The work carried out at night," the president noted, "did nevertheless enable bloodshed to be averted. After all, the volunteer detachments on the border of the Komrat rayon are ready to take action in defence of Moldova's territorial integrity. However, the situation is fully under the control of the republic's leadership."

The president urged the Supreme Soviet to strip some Gagauz deputies of their deputy's powers. He expressed regret over the fact that the army had not carried out its promises not to intervene in the situation in the south of Moldova. According to him, "in a telephone conversation Dmitriy Yazov, USSR defense minister, promised to order the command of the Bolgrad division stationed nearby not to intervene in the events taking place." "However, its units appeared in Komrat last night," the president said.

New Moldavian Political Divisions Examined

PM2610122390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 90 p 2

[Report by special correspondent A. Ganelin under the "Nationalities Question" rubric: "Moldovan Cocktail. New States Have Emerged on This Republic's Territory—the Gagauz and Dnestr Moldavian Republics. Kishinev Has Not Recognized Them. What Next?"—last two paragraphs are commentary by correspondent A. Khantsevich]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] ...The Moldovan [Moldavian] Supreme Soviet gave five days for the unconstitutional decisions regarding the creation of the Gagauz and Dnestr Moldavian republics to be revised. Far longer than that has now elapsed and the "so-called republics" have not given in. What will happen next? Moldova has no military force capable of taking action against the separatists. Should they be blockaded? But it is also a question of who is blockading whom. The Gagauz Republic is a strong agricultural area, the Dnestr Moldavian Republic a strong industrial region. So what will happen next?

Gagauzia and the Dnestr Moldavian Republic have suggested that Moldova hold talks on neutral territory. The terms are: that representatives of the new state formations are included in the Moldovan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] delegation discussing the conclusion of the Union Treaty; the language law is revised; the resolution on the problem of the Gagauz ethnic group is repealed; and the Moldovan SSR Supreme Soviet International Relations Committee is transformed into a Committee on Nationalities Questions with the right of veto on laws concerning ethnic groups.

Komrat and Tiraspol are demanding that talks be held with them on an equal footing. There are even proposals for a confederation of three republics—Moldova and the Gagauz and Dnestr Moldavian republics—to be set up. But it was said at an enlarged Moldovan Presidential Council that there can be no question of any talks with separatists. President Mircha Snegur said at one meeting that the parliament would not retreat.

...Moldovan People's Front activists in Kishinev are saying: "Russians came to Moldova not as a sovereign state but as an outlying region of the empire. Even now they refuse to learn our language and they do not respect the republic's flag or its president. The 'alien' visitors are tearing our homeland to pieces."

...At present only the Gagauz republic has recognized the Dnestr Moldavian republic and vice versa.

"Do you hope to be recognized as sovereign republics by peoples, parliaments, and governments," I asked in Tiraspol. People there harbor no illusions; they realize that no one will agree to this now in the USSR. People in the Dnestr Moldavian Republic are preparing to secure recognition via the economy and to organize trade with the union republics. "It will not be possible to trade with us and pretend that we do not exist." Further, the "so-called republics" think that they will find backing in the autonomous republics which have now declared sovereignty. They are hoping for the recognition of these new "so-called republics." The United Nations and Moscow have not recognized them—they themselves have recognized one another.

...Nonindigenous residents of the national republics have already grown tired of being "zombies," "occupiers," "aliens," and a "fifth column." What have they done? Did they sign the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact? Millions of ordinary people, hearing "Let us destroy the 'Soviet empire'" at rallies are wondering what will happen to them tomorrow. They realize that it is not only emperors who perish when empires collapse....

It is hard to argue with Aleksandr Isayevich Solzhenitsyn when he writes that you cannot restrain by force anyone who wants to secede—so let them secede. If Moldova is attracted to Romania that is its right. But how will this happen in practice? Will there be a commission of experts, state compensation? You cannot settle everything in a day. People want to have guarantees for today and tomorrow.

It is easy to say as one great politician did: "Russia is ready to accept these people." But people realize that it is hardly ready to do so economically. Where are the apartments, the jobs, and last the money to receive them? That is why many people are not prepared to go. The nonindigenous population will argue and act as follows: If you stay, you must have firm guarantees that you will not end up a "second class" citizen in an alien state. In order for this to occur republics, autonomous formations, and free cities have to be set up in areas with a high density of nonindigenous citizens. Even "so-called" republics. "So-called republics" could appear not only in Moldova, but for instance also in the Baltic, in Kazakhstan, and other now-sovereign republics.

...The refugees from the Transcaucasus and Central Asia almost provoked an all-Union crisis. What if 60 million people flee—equivalent to the population of a vast country? It is difficult then to expect them to love democracy and perestroyka. You cannot frighten Russian speakers by saying that generals may come to power instead of the USSR president. Many people are already saying: Be it generals or admirals, just keep the country afloat. Let us have some kind of stability. People are living in republics where the situation resembles a live grenade, and they are beginning to think it can only be restrained by a strong fist.

...The following slogan has become customary at rallies in Kishinev, as in other cities: "The USSR Is the Peoples' Jail." Well if anyone believes that, they should remember this slogan: "To Freedom with a Clear Conscience." Without hostages bases for partisan warfare, newspaper campaigns, investigations, and calls to fight "the enemies of the people"....

Stop the Press

The sociopolitical crisis in Moldova seems to be nearing the critical point. Elections to the Gagauz Supreme Soviet have been announced for 28 October. In this connection Moldovan SSR President M. Snegur has appealed to the Gagauzy. He urged the population in the southern areas to refuse to participate in the election since they could bring the republic to the brink of civil war.

This threat is quite real. People are continuing to enlist in voluntary detachments in Kishinev and other areas of Moldova. The date for their demonstration march has even been announced. Political leaders and the republic's government have a matter of days to resolve the disagreements peacefully and prevent clashes.

Ukraine Supreme Soviet Amends Constitution

LD2510160890 Kiev International Service in English 0000 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Excerpts] The second session of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet continued its work today in Kiev. The peoples' deputies examined two articles of the current constitution of the Ukrainian SSR, in part [as heard] article seven of the Ukraine's fundamental law.

From now on the content of Article Seven boils down to the following: Any political and public movement aimed at changing the territorial integrity of the Ukraine and its state structure are proclaimed illegal.

Tension was high at the session hall when the deputies examined amendments to Article 112 of the current constitution of the Ukrainian SSR about forming the highest legal body in the republic, a constitutional court. The question was put in the following way: Whether the constitutional court must be fully departized [as heard] or these or other parties may stand behind it. [passage omitted]

As a result of the repeated voting, Article 112 of the Ukrainian SSR Constitution has not been changed completely, though now it reads that membership in a constitutional court rules out belonging to any party, and its representatives cannot simultaneously enter the compositional bodies whose activities are under the supervision of the court, and also be deputies of the Ukrainian SSR.

Opening of Second Rukh Congress Reported in Kiev

LD2610082590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1509 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The second congress of Rukh, which stands for the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka, has opened in Kiev. Our correspondent Vladimir Sokolov is accredited to the congress. He is on the line. Hello, Vladimir Yuryevich.

[Sokolov] Let me begin with some background information. In the first place, the Ukrainian word Rukh means movement in Russian. Second, as my invitation ticket shows, the words for perestroyka have already been removed from Rukh's name. Third, in the interests of accuracy I ought to point out that Rukh itself calls this congress an all-Ukrainian assembly. Well, a short address opening the congress was delivered by Patriarch Mstyslav, the head of the Ukrainian Autocephalic Church—in other words, a church which is self-managing, and most importantly independent of the Moscow Patriarchate. He had been invited to come from the United States to attend the congress in the Ukraine. The work proper then began.

The congress is an impressive event, it must be said. It is being attended by 2,250 delegates, including representatives from 24 countries with Ukrainian communities,

some of which are quite big; guests from almost all Union republics; and from the Popular Fronts and democratic movements with whom Rukh maintains ties. There are also journalists from over 30 countries. The numerous guests who have received personal invitations include a few unexpected names. For example there is Kravchuk, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet, and Shelrest, former first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. The congress is being held in one of Kiev's biggest halls, the Ukraina Palace. Security is being provided by sturdy fellows who remind one a bit of vigilantes. All of them are dressed in military-style camouflage. They are also extremely vigilant. The first time my pass was checked, I was still 100 meters away from the hall.

As it begins its second congress, Rukh is completely different from the organization it was when first set up.

[Announcer] What has changed, Vladimir Yuryevich?

[Sokolov] A great deal. The original aim proclaimed by this organization was to help the Communist Party with the perestroyka which it had begun. For this reason it received widespread support. Very soon, however, all mention of the party disappeared from Rukh's policy documents. Subsequently its leaders, the poets Ivan Drach and Dmytro Pavlychko and some others, left the party of their own accord. Rukh has now become, generally speaking, an association of anti-party forces. It has spread most widely in the western oblasts of the Ukraine where its representatives won a majority in a number of soviets at the last elections. Rukh has become the nucleus of the official opposition in the republic's Supreme Soviet. At this congress, Rukh intends to adopt radical changes to its program, strategy, and tactics.

[Announcer] Can we tell yet what direction these changes will take?

[Sokolov] Yes. Just before the opening of the congress I put this question to Mikhail Nikolayevich Horyn, head of Rukh's Secretariat and a people's deputy in the republic's parliament. This is what he said:

[Begin recording] [Horyn] We are discussing questions of strategy and tactics. The political situation in the Ukraine has changed in recent months. The goal which we set ourselves a year ago, the establishment of a sovereign Ukrainian state within the USSR, is now rejected by the majority of Rukh organizations in the oblasts and rayons. The federal nature of the USSR is rejected. The question of setting up an independent Ukrainian state is being raised. So the program will be changed. Rukh's goal will be the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state. [passage omitted]

Rukh itself does not plan to turn itself into a party or to change its structure in any fundamental way. We are now admitting collective members, but we are not excluding individual members either.

[Sokolov] How do you view the immediate prospects, following the congress?

[Horyn] I believe that Rukh will get its second wind after the congress. [end recording]

[Sokolov] Well roughly the same things, dealing mostly with the future of the Ukraine where the fundamental element in the main report delivered at the congress today by Rukh's leader, Ivan Drash. He criticized everybody who, in his view, is impeding genuine sovereignty for the Ukraine, ranging from the Kremlin to Solzhenitsyn and even the late lamented Gen. Denikin. He also warned that Rukh would strive to achieve its objectives by both parliamentary and extra-parliamentary methods, by the organisation of strikes pickets, refusal to pay taxes, and other methods of civil disobedience.

[Announcer] Do we know when the congress will end?

[Sokolov] The congress will last four days. Ahead there is a report on Rukh's place in organs of people's power and in political and economic reform, its position on the problem of a national Ukrainian Army, and on inter-ethnic relations. Decisions will be adopted and we will obviously tell you about them.

Economic, Political Independence Sought

PM2610135290 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Oct 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Sergey Tsikora under "Direct Line" rubric: "Rukh Congress Opens"]

[Text] Kiev—This is the first time that the "Ukraina" Palace, originally built as the venue for republic Communist Party Congresses, has been put at the disposal of an organization openly opposed to the Ukrainian Communist Party. The second All-Ukrainian Rukh [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka] Congress opened here 25 October.

The key issues at the second Rukh Congress will be the introduction of fundamental additions to its program and statutes. In conversations with the main speakers who will address the congress it has emerged that it will be a question of adjusting not just tactical issues, but also strategic objectives. It is proposed, for instance, to remove the thesis of building a sovereign Ukraine "under the wing" of the Soviet Union, replacing it by the establishment of a free, independent, democratic Ukrainian council [sobornyy] state. It should be politically and economically independent of what is now referred to as the center, but it must under no circumstances pull out from the market established as the result of the economic activity of all republics.

"What we need now is a good mechanism to enable us to translate our political ideas into reality," M. Goryn, head of the Rukh Secretariat, said at a press conference. "I believe that such a mechanism will be elaborated at the congress and that our organization will enter a new orbit as regards its activities.

The congress is being attended by guests from 28 countries where Ukrainians live and where Rukh support committees exist. The congress of the Ukrainian People's Movement is scheduled to last four days.

Belorussian Parliament Approves Sovereignty Bill

LD2610113890 Moscow TASS in English 1058 GMT 26 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondents Vladimir Bogdanov and Aleksandr Kryzhanovskiy]

[Text] Minsk October 26 TASS—The Belorussian parliament has approved the first reading of "the bill on key principles of people's power in the Belorussian Republic."

The need for the bill was prompted by the present uncertainty of the situation in the republic which is now simultaneously a component part of the Soviet Union and an independent state, as is clear from the recent declaration on sovereignty.

According to the bill, all power in the republic belongs to the Belorussian people, who exercise it directly or through their representative bodies. The bill establishes supremacy of the Belorussian constitution and laws over the Soviet Union's legislation which operates on its territory only if it does not contradict republican laws.

Strict restrictions were established for political parties and mass associations. They are forbidden to interfere in the operation of state bodies and government officials.

The bill provides for depolitisation in running state-owned enterprises, establishments and organisations, which are not allowed to be administered through the system of political bodies.

Servicemen and law enforcement officers are now not limited in their work by political decisions of mass organisations of which they are members.

The package of legal acts regulating the republic's transition to a market economy is supplemented by bills on banks and banking in Belorussia.

These bills provide for the establishment of a republican banking system where the National Bank will be an independent legal entity and not a branch of the USSR State Bank.

However, parliament was not satisfied with the two proposed versions, and they were sent back to appropriate committees.

Caucasus

USSR Officials Abducted in Nagorno-Karabakh

LD2510204290 Moscow TASS in English 1826 GMT 25 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent V. Byrkin]

[Text] Stepanakert Azerbaijan October 25 TASS—Tension escalates in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region. Four USSR Interior Ministry officials, members of the ministry's investigation team working in the region, have been taken hostage in the Mardakert District.

An anonymous telephone call to the local TASS office revealed that the main condition for the release of the hostages is the transfer of all Armenians detained during a passport check-up on Wednesday from Azerbaijani residential areas to Armenian ones.

Renewed Tensions in Nagorno-Karabakh Reviewed

NC2610122490 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] Stepanakert, 25 Oct (ARMENPRES)—The situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] has again become extremely tense. Such a development was only to be expected. The people of the NKAO had not the slightest doubt that the virtual unilateral disarmament of the Armenians at a time when Azerbaijani armed groups disguised as special purpose detachments are appearing in the oblast would eventually have undesirable consequences.

The situation is particularly tense in Mardakertskiy Rayon where large-scale cattle rustling has become common. On 20 October armed persons attacked drovers Napoleon Arakelyan and Vitalik Danielyan near Leninavan. The attackers took them, 250 heads of cattle, and 700 sheep and goats to an unidentified location.

The abduction of Vagram Arushanyan, Narine Ovsepyan, and Tsovinar Arakelyan—three students at the Stepanakert Institute, not far from the Azerbaijani village of Srkhavend—has strained the people's patience to its limits. The students were traveling by car to their home in Artsvashen village. The driver of the car, Vazgen Osipyan, was also taken hostage. The identitity of a fifth abducted passenger is still not known.

On 22 October five Azerbaijanis were taken hostage a few kilometers away from the Azerbaijani village of Umutlu in Mardakertskiy Rayon.

On the same day Stepanakert students asked the military commandant to take urgent measures to secure the release of their endangered friends. Negotiations took place on the exchange of hostages, but so far they have had no results.

Also on that same day, a car convoy traveling from Kelbadzhar to Mirbashir was pelted with stones in Leninavan. The soldiers escorting the convoy opened fire, killing Volodya Ayrabetyan, a resident of the town, and wounded a woman, Rolya Martirosyan. Abres Astsaturyan, 78, was also seriously wounded. According to preliminary data, seven Azerbaijanis and three servicemen were also wounded.

On 20 October, five Azerbaijanis armed with automatic weapons attacked shepherd Shahen Babayan from Khandzadzor village in Gadrutskiy Rayon. They beat him up and stole 350 heads of cattle. An attempt to steal animals took place on 19 October at the Ilyich farm in Martuninskiy Rayon. The attackers were well armed.

Berdadzor village in Shushinskiy Rayon remains a hot spot in the NKAO. There was an exchange of fire on the evening of 21 October between residents of this village and the Azerbaijani village of Aganus in Lachinskiy rayon. According to preliminary data, a resident of Aganus was killed and people were wounded in Berdadzor. The operative investigation team of the Internal Affairs Ministry and the units belonging to commandant's office of the state of emergency region are investigating this incident.

Armenian Commission Meets NKAO Commandant

NC2610135290 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1900 GMT 25 Oct 90

[Text] Members of the Armenian parliament's standing commission on legal affairs are now visiting Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, NKAO] at the instructions of the Armenian parliament. The aim of the visit is to ascertain the circumstances surrounding the illegal detention of two people's deputies of Armenia, Roles Agadzhanyan and Hamlet Grigoryan, and to present the findings to the Armenian parliament.

Our republic's representatives Kin Balayan and Hamlet Ovsepyan met Lieutenant Colonel Mazukin, military prosecutor of Stepanakert garrison, and Major General Safonov, the commandant of the state of emergency region.

In response to Kin Balayan's question as to why the commandant is implementing the orders of the [Azerbaijani] Organizational Committee despite the fact that the well-known 28 November 1989 decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet stipulates the subordination of interior ministry troops to the Union Monitoring and Observation Commission, the general replied that he can act no differently as the Union Monitoring and Observation Commission is not based in Stepanakert and its chairman, Foteyev, only visits the oblast for a few days every six months.

Safonov stressed that he had often asked Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Bakatin, the USSR internal affairs Minister, to base the Union Monitoring and Observation Commission in NKAO.

Asked why the Goris-Lachin road, let alone other highways, has not yet been opened, the general declared that his troops are ready to open the road at this very moment provided that order comes from above.

How can one talk about an order from above when there already exist the 5 October 1989 and 5 March 1990 decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet as well as the declaration of the second congress of the USSR people's deputies? Who will give this order considering that these documents were issued by the country's leader, Mikhail Gorbachev?

Armenian Party Congress Resolution on NKAO

91US0036A Yerevan GOLOS ARMENII in Russian 28 Sep 90 p 1

[Resolution of the 29th Communist Party of Armenia Congress on the Situation in Nagornyy Karabakh]

[Text] The national liberation movement that has developed in Nagornyy Karabakh and that is based on the principle of self-determination of the nations and the international standards for the defense of human rights, has, naturally, gained mass support in Armenia.

In response to the Karabakh movement came the pogrom against Armenians in Sumgait, Gandzak (Kirovabad), Baku and elsewhere; the forcible deportation of the Armenian population from Azerbaijan; the periodic blockade of the NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] and the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]; and other unlawful actions, that sharply exacerbated the situation in the region.

Tension in the NKAO and Shaumyanovskiy Rayon and the Getashenskiy Subrayon of the Azerbaijan SSR has reached its apogee. Everything is being done to eliminate the autonomy of the NKAO. Soviet Army subunits and troops from the internal service, which are essentially involved in political operations contrary to their duties, have been engaged to this end. A situation that is intolerable from the viewpoint of international law, even given military occupation conditions, has been established.

With the patronage and connivance of the center, the Azerbaijan authorities are consistently continuing their actions aimed at a change in the demographic situation in the oblast. The far-reaching purpose of this is the elimination of the NKAO as an independent administrative-territorial unit. The rayon party committees and Soviet authorities are being abolished. With the help of

the republic organizing committee and the Army subunits within its charge, the Azerbaijan authorities are directly threatening and persecuting the Armenian population and forcing it to abandon its native parts and historic Armenian territory.

An anti-Army campaign has been organized in the country with the connivance of the central authorities. The mass media are consistently distorting the situation, disorienting public opinion of the country and the world, and simultaneously doing everything to consign to oblivion the mass pogroms against the Armenian population and the shameful facts of deportation. All this has brought the two neighboring republics to the brink of interethnic war, aroused the anger and indignation of the working people and communists of Armenia and shaken the authority of the party and its leadership.

The congress deems mistaken and rejects the CPSU Central Committee Politburo decision on 21 February 1988, which viewed the Karabakh movement as the illegal actions of a group of "extremists" and "nationalists" contrary to the interests of Azeris, thereby inciting an anti-Armenian mood in the neighboring republic and creating the prerequisites for new tragedies. The congress demands that the CPSU Central Committee consider this decision inoperative.

For normal relations between the two peoples and a peaceful life, constructive dialogue is needed, for whose realization the congress demands:

the immediate restoration in full of the structure of Soviet power and the party authorities of the NKAO at all levels and the abolition of the illegal republic organizing committee of Azerbaijan;

the lifting of the state of emergency imposed in the NKAO in connection with the tragic January events in Baku and the withdrawal of forces from the NKAO, they being deployed along the border of the NKAO, Azerbaijan, and Armenia. In order to accommodate transport communications between the NKAO and Azerbaijan, the NKAO and Armenia, and Azerbaijan and Armenia, the opening of the Stepanakert-Lachin-Goris road;

negotiations between the leadership of the Republic of Armenia and the Azerbaijan SSR with the participation of a personal representative of the president of the USSR on questions of mutual interest;

the adoption and implementation of guaranteed measures to prevent changes by the leadership of the Azerbaijan SSR in the present demographic situation in the NKAO;

a referendum in the NKAO for free expression of the people's wishes;

together with other autonomous formations of the Land of Soviets, recognition of the NKAO as a subject of a renewed federation;

the raising before the CPSU Central Committee Politburo of the question of the immediate examination of the situation that has taken shape in Nagornyy Karabakh and the adoption of measures to put an end to the flagrant flouting of human rights and the military terror and to ensure for the Armenian population of the oblast the right of free self-determination.

The congress condemns any manifestation of violence and considers political means and constitutional provisions the sole path of a solution of contentious interethnic problems.

The 29th Communist Party of Armenia Congress demands the newly elected Central Committee adopt all measures for the extrication of the Karabakh problem from deadlock and realize the just demand of the people.

That it forward this resolution to the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, the central committees of the communist parties of the Union republics, and the supreme soviets of the USSR and the Union republics.

Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan Sets Policy Objectives

NC2510194090 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 24 Oct 90

["The Current Political Situation in Armenia: We Are Reporting the Speech Made by Levon Ter-Petrosyan, Chairman of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet, at the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet 22 October Session"—ARMENPRES headline]

[Text] After the fall of Rome, mankind was finally convinced that nothing is eternal in this world. Therefore, it was clear that the last colonial system, the Soviet empire, had sooner or later to come to the brink of collapse. Maybe that was a revelation for our people, who were in deep sleep. Yet, the developments of the last few years showed symptoms of this collapse, which today is becoming a fact due to certain objective factors.

Today, only one thing depends on us, on all the peoples of the Soviet Union, and on all mankind: To make that collapse as bloodless and painless as possible; to make the transition to a new system as bloodless and peaceful as possible. Here the experience of East European countries inspire us to hope that this is possible; that the Soviet leaders and the republics will display enough tolerance and awareness and will not let the situation culminate in grave confrontation and major tremors.

As any collapsing and tottering empire will, the Soviet Union is naturally exerting its own last efforts to maintain the country's integrity and the totalitarian structure of power. For that purpose, it has and uses very effective political, economic, ethnic, and military levers.

It could be said that the political lever is exhausting itself after the declarations of autonomy or independence. The instructions from the center have been ended in those republics which have chosen the path of democracy.

Most of the republics have established their own constitutions and the supremacy of their laws over those of the Union. This has already become a functioning mechanism, for the central authorities have lost their real political power and, as a rule, their decisions are not implemented in the republics. In addition to this, there is the bankruptcy of that ideology upon which communism's political regime was based. Naturally, the center had to search for new levers. Of these, economics is the most effective.

Having lost its political lucidity, the center would probably use the economic lever in the future to keep the republics dependent on it.

By making use of its supervisory role over the material supply, banking system, money circulation, and foreign trade and foreign currency, the center will apparently do everything possible to maintain its totalitarian regime. In this regard, there are objective factors and as well as the subjective desires of the center. Despite the most conspicuous expression of political independence, the republics, fearing the uncertainties of the future, appear to be opting for the time being to maintain the economic ties developed in the Union. They are doing this by simply moving from vertical to horizontal relations. That is, they are establishing these ties through agreements signed between them.

However, no matter how effective the economic lever of the center be, in principle the center's desires deeply contradict the objective course of the country's economic development; that is, the basic concept of decentralization which entails the consolidation of the republics' economic independence. Politically unintended consequences will follow this. It will not help maintain the country's political integrity. This contradiction is an objective factor, and if the country really desires to surmount the economic crisis, it has no other choice. Thus, this lever is actually upsetting the objective course of economic development. For that very reason, it is bound to fail.

The next lever which the center might use to consolidate the integrity of the empire is the exacerbation of interethnic tensions. As will any colonial state, the Soviet Union has used, is using, and will use this lever from which we have suffered most.

Despite the deplorable events that have taken place, the Soviet peoples will muster enough courage to differentiate their real interests from those of the empire.

The fourth lever should not be discarded either: the possibility of the use of raw force. If we look at it objectively we will see that the center is in fact left with only this power. The Army, the Internal Affairs Ministry and the Committee for State Security are the only ones that submit to the center. Unfortunately, the center's control of these forces might also lead to the application of raw force at any moment. In fact, such attempts have already been made, in some cases justified—I have in mind Azerbaijan where attempts were made to forcibly topple the legal authorities and the raw force of the center was was used as a counter measure. Today, the developments are such that the application of that force in any region might engender a conflagration throughout the Soviet Union. At the same time, it is obvious that the center is patiently tolerating numerous illegalities and oppressions in places to which it could have responded instantly in the past. This reflects the center's awareness of the enormous responsibility it bears. If force is used the Soviet Union would forgo its policy of development. This fact must inspire us with optimism, for despite all, so far this consideration is present in the policy of the center which would use force only in an extreme situation.

In addition to the developments taking place in the Soviet Union, the events in Transcaucasia are also vital for our republic. What has happened in Transcaucasia?

Democracy has been established in Armenia and the communist regime abolished. The opposite has taken place in Azerbaijan where the communist regime has consolidated itself. Georgia still finds itself in preelection instability, and it is hard to predict the outcome of the election campaign.

If a simplistic comparison is to be made it seems that the situation in Transcaucasia resembles that of 1920. Communist Azerbaijan has become the rallying point for the center in order to fight democratic Armenia and, if necessary, Georgia. In fact, we do see this cooperation between the center and Azerbaijan in Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast]. This state of affairs might bring temporary gains for Azerbaijan, and apparently it does.

However, this is a simplistic comparison because the picture is different. Whereas in 1920 Azerbaijan came forward as the ally of the increasingly powerful communist Russia, now it has become the rallying point for the Soviet center which is losing its real power. By doing so, Azerbaijan has aligned itself not only against Armenia but also against democratic Russia. This essentially alters the essence of things and gives us the possibility to maneuver. We must grasp the importance of this nuance and should take advantage of it. I am thinking about the possibility of establishing serious political-economic relations between Armenia and Russia based on common interests. My meeting with Boris Yeltsin and the ensuing exchange of messages is a manifestation of this. It also left its imprint on the Russian parliament where a very important decision was passed concerning us.

Following the developments in the Soviet Union and Transcaucasia, fundamental changes took place in the consciousness of the Armenian people over the last few years. It finally woke from its stupor and astonishingly discovered that the Soviet Union cannot provide external political guarantees for its existence. Proof? The massacres of Sumgait, Kirovabad, and Baku; hundreds of thousands of refugees; the continuous blockade of

Artsakh and Armenia; and the prospect of withdrawal of the Russian troops from Transcaucasia.

In the face of this cold shower and bitter experience of history, the Armenian political mind and the existing national liberation movement finally concluded that the Armenian people must create new political guarantees by its own powers for the sake of its existence, not imaginary but real guarantees:

First: The communist regime, which is run by the foreigners and which serves the foreigners, should be replaced with a democratic regime that conducts a national policy so as to preclude the influence of any foreign power and to be guided solely by the interests of its own people. This issue has already been resolved. However, this is as yet a partial success and touches only the upper echelons of the regime. The final resolution of this issue depends on the upcoming elections for the local councils.

The second guarantee: to speedily overtake our immediate neighbors in socioeconomic development, namely Georgia and Azerbaijan with whom we cannot compete in numbers and resources. Our only advantage over them would be our effective advancement in these areas. To achieve that, tangible prerequisites already exist, the most important of which is the establishment of a democratic regime in Armenia.

By taking advantage of the freedoms provided by democracy and of the possibility of running an independent policy Armenia, in overtaking Azerbaijan and Georgia, we would be in a position to achieve radical socioeconomic reforms that would ensure development. Among these reforms, of particular importance are the laws on private ownership and land. These laws will give the Armenian people the opportunity to display their innate business and entrepreneurial abilities which have been criminally wrested away from it for the last 70 years. It was because of these abilities that the Armenians occupied leading positions in the economic life of Tbilisi and Baku. It is with these same abilities that our diaspora brothers occupy palpable positions in business despite bitter competition.

Therefore, it is not by chance that the first laws to be presented to the parliament by the Armenian government will be on ownership and land.

Another important factor in our effort to overtake the neighbors will be the role played by the diaspora, whose financial, political, and intellectual possibilities might substantially assist in our republic's growth.

The third guarantee for the Armenian people and for the survival of Armenian statehood would be the creation of our own national armed forces. A state cannot exist without an Army. The experience of 1918 and 1942 confirmed that at those exceedingly fateful times the military potential of the Armenian people was stationed outside the borders of Armenia. This was the fundamental reason the Armenian Pannational Movement raised the issue of creating our own armed forces in its very first program.

Today there are various proposals as to how to create that Army. Many think naively that the Army must be formed out of the existing border guards. It is obvious that the state must be defended by a professional army. There is a very natural and logical way out which also interests the other republics of the Soviet Union: The members of each nation must serve on the territory of his republic.

Nearly 40,000 Armenian servicemen now serve outside the territory of Armenia. If they serve on the Armenian territory, albeit in Soviet Army units, it is obvious that in case of a danger they will fulfill their duties to the fatherland. This is the correct course, and one could say that the Armenian parliament has taken a very realistic step by suspending both the spring and fall conscriptions. Eventually, the command of the Soviet Army would be forced to to come to terms with this situation and would create conditions so that the youth could serve in Armenia.

We must also take into account the possibility that the Soviet Army might one day abandon Armenia. At the same time, it should not be forgotten that Russia has strategic interests shaped over centuries and she could not forgo those interests at one go. We might even be forced to tolerate the existence of the Russian military bases in Armenia for some time to come.

The fourth guarantee would be the breach of Armenia's political isolation and the forging of our own foreign policy from which we have been deprived for 70 years. In all these years we had no direct relations with even the republics of the Soviet Union. Today we must forge that policy and must penetrate the international organizations. It seems that we might very soon have at least unofficial representations in the United States and France. We must develop our ties with the international organizations at all levels as much as possible. There are possibilities for this and the first steps are already being taken.

Finally, the fifth and the most important guarantee, which is essential for the normal functioning of a state: the improvement of relations with our immediate neighbors Iran and Turkey. This should be based on pragmatism stemming from the interests of the Armenian people. This issue has become a matter of political exploitation, but the healthy forces grasp correctly the imperative for this move. And it will be up to the authorities in Armenia to formulate and conduct this policy.

I am sure that the Armenian people, who have attained high political awareness, are in a position to differentiate between the real national interests and the ideas that have been turned into subjects for political exploitation.

The objective before the Armenian people is to transform our republic into a politically and economically self-managing system, and into an independently functioning organism which will be adept at taking maximum advantage of the domestic and foreign opportunities and give a timely response to the menacing political and economic dangers.

It is also the time to learn serious lessons from our bitter historical experience and transform ourselves from being a daredevil and romantic nation into one of cool-headed, realist, and pragmatic nation whose every step should be measured and based on concrete and unerring calculation.

Maneuverability and flexible diplomacy should become the basic component of our policy. We must closely follow the activities of our political counterparts and antagonists and through delicate maneuvers exploit even the smallest antagonism between them. For that, we must once and for all renounce showy and spurious political actions which needlessly provoke our political counterparts and opponents, and lead to no positive result, thus creating deep disillusionment among the masses.

Diplomacy is a system and not a mere aggregate of coincidental acts. Therefore, any elected authority pursuing an independent policy has no right to make concessions to peripheral pressures and to be diverted from its basic policy. A political system could only be confronted by another political system and not by isolated acts contradicting the spirit of a given policy. That does not however mean that the political system is a dogma and is not subject to correction; it could be corrected in line with the demands of the situation.

In summing up this brief analysis, the essence of the policy adopted by the present democratic government of Armenia could be formulated in the following terms: to create, step by step, new and durable political guarantees for the sake of our republic's survival and growth by evading serious confrontation?? without excessive showiness and hastiness, but calmly through delicate maneuvers and flexible diplomacy, while at the same time acting with resolution and without delay. If this objective is achieved it means we have fully accomplished our duty to the coming generations and we could then leave to them the fulfillment of the rest of o. national aspirations.

The reality is not an ossified history, and no matter how durable it appears it is still subject to unexpected fluctuations. By creating guarantees for our nation we will be ready to utilize those fluctuations.

The times have given us real possibilities to lay the foundations for the realization of our national aspirations and it will be unforgivable foolishness not to take advantage of that opportunity.

Shenin Comments on Armenian Party Congress

91US0035A Yerevan GOLOS ARMENII in Russian 29 Sep 90 p 1

[Report on interview with O.S. Shenin by Zh. Martirosova: "Oleg Shenin: 'The Congress Adopted the Correct Position'"]

[Text] During the 19th Armenian Communist Party Congress Zh. Martirosova, correspondent of GOLOS ARMENII, met with O.S. Shenin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, who was taking part in the party forum, and asked him to answer a number of questions.

[Martirosova] Oleg Semenovich, speaking at the congress, you emphasized that you had yourself volunteered for this trip to Armenia. What motives prompted this decision?

[Shenin] A desire to investigate the entire complexity of the atmosphere, understand the situation that has come about in the republic and attempt to understand and do everything that might help stabilize the situation.

[Martirosova] What list of most important problems would you draw up for the congress' discussion?

[Shenin] I have been made sharply aware that the atmosphere is overstrained and that the problems of relations of the two neighboring republics are not affording an opportunity to move forward and are preventing the communists from dealing with specific party issues. It would be very apropos were the congress to adopt an appeal to the supreme soviets of Armenia and Azerbaijan proposing that these two legislatures sit down at the negotiating table. Only in this case might the center join in and might there be contacts at party and public organization level and also at the refugee assistance committee level. A tremendous number of people could join in this dialogue. And this is surely what is most important for ascertaining all the positions and finding the correct emphases.

I believe that the Communist Party of Armenia has many intraparty problems connected with determination of its status and relations with the primary party organizations. Perhaps not enough has been heard about these subjects at the congress as yet, but the discussion and adoption of program documents will, nonetheless, serve as a serious reference point for all the party organizations. And reference points are indispensable because we cannot fail to discern the feelings of confusion and uncertainty of many communists. However, unless the adoption of the new program and rules is combined with specific actions, this will lead to serious consequences in the party.

However, as far as the status of the Communist Party of Armenia and its name are concerned, the congress has adopted a correct enough position. These serious matters cannot be decided without regard for the opinion of each communist; there needs to be a referendum. But this also

needs to be prepared lest the final decision be influenced by the emotions or actions or particular persons. A conscious choice is important and valuable.

[Martirosova] What in your opinion does the concept of a republic's sovereignty dictate and how does it tie in with the independence of a republic Communist Party?

A republic's sovereignty determines some specific rights of the republic. At the same time, however, there are issues on which there is no need to waste efforts on the solution of some problems or other. I allude to questions connected with defense, power engineering, transport. They should be delegated to the union level. On the one hand there are real rights that a republic determines entirely independently and there are rights that a republic declares are a matter for the center, and it retains the right to choose. In itself a union of sovereign states does not in the least prevent there being a uniform Communist Party. It would aspire to unite healthy forces, at least.

The CPSU Rules also determine that the republic communist parties are independent. Proceeding from the situation, they may formulate their own policy decisions, independently assign personnel and also decide questions of financial activity. In the event of a republic Communist Party disagreeing with a decision of the Politburo and the Central Committee, it has the right to raise this matter at a CPSU plenum and adopt decisions at its own plenum on convening a CPSU Central Committee Plenum. That is, the rights are extensive, and it is necessary to employ them in full and then determine what to do next.

Even prior to the 28th CPSU Congress tremendous attention was paid to current intraparty problems, which had a disastrous effect on the solution of many social and economic questions that are acutely disturbing to people today and on whose solution the future of our entire society depends. Yes, political debate is useful, but the atmosphere in the country is so complex that it is time for the party to act. There's no denying that people are fed up with watching the party wallow in its own problems, muddling ever more thoroughly the tangle of endless problems.

[Martirosova] Oleg Semenovich, I believe that our interview would be incomplete were we not to touch on the problem of Karabakh. How in this connection do you evaluate national relations in our region against the background of interethnic relations in the country? And your attitude toward the latest blockade of Armenia?

[Shenin] I believe that hoping for no particular reason, while doing nothing, that the problem will settle itself and that passions will subside of their own accord is simply hopeless. Constant mutual recrimination has so inflamed people's minds that they can no longer think in other categories. I repeat that the supreme soviets of the two republics should unfailingly sit down at the negotiating table together with competent specialists and conduct a concrete discussion and seek answers to the most acute problems together.

The situation in Armenia and in Nagornyy Karabakh simply cannot be compared with the processes in the Baltic, Central Asia, and Moldova [Moldavia]. These are entirely different situations, and it is for this reason difficult for the center to catch the existing nuances and control these complex processes.

Attitude toward the blockade? Negative, of course. How can we have a composed view of the fact that a whole republic has been paralyzed and that construction in the disaster zone, which I am about to visit, has been frozen. I view the blockade as a most extreme, unwarranted measure of pressure, and the active assistance of both the government of the country and the leadership of the two republics is needed to do away with this defect. It is essential to settle the problem as quickly as possible, winter being at hand, as they say.

[Martirosova] In the wake of the Karabakh movement, against the background of the fact that centrifugal forces have begun to develop in the country, in the autonomous entities, on the contrary, centripetal forces are being observed. How do you evaluate this process, which is contributing to a strengthening of the center? And inasmuch as the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast is an autonomous formation, might this to some extent be reflected in a solution of the Karabakh problem?

[Shenin] All questions connected with the autonomous entities and autonomous formations, which will themselves determine both their name and their status, will be taken into consideration during preparation of the new Union treaty. Therefore, I anticipate that the autonomous entities could acquire an opportunity to decide their fate themselves. They should have the final say.

[Martirosova] You are about to visit the disaster zone. How pertinent remains the assistance rendered by the Union republics when many construction detachments are leaving Armenia for this reason or the other?

[Shenin] First of all, the program of restoration of the areas that suffered as a result of the earthquake needs considerable adjustment, and determining the timeframe of completion of the work being done and the sources of financing is a vital necessity. People should know specifically what will be restored and when.

[Martirosova] Oleg Semenovich, do you believe that the present Communist Party of Armenia Congress will be the last?

[Shenin] No, I do not. An absolute majority of delegates to the congress is for an independent republic Communist Party, but as part of the CPSU. I believe that the second stage of the congress will be fruitful and I will unfailingly participate.

Armenian Komsomol Renames Itself 'Youth Union'

NC2510124190 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] The 31st congress of the Armenian Leninist Communist Youth League [Komsomol] continued its deliberations yesterday and renamed the organization the Youth Union of Armenia [Hayastani Yeritasardakan Miutyun]. After detailed discussions the congress confirmed the Union's program and bylaws.

The congress endorsed a statement on youth participation in the reconstruction of the earthquake zone and appealed to the youth to give their support to the struggle of Nagorno-Karabakh.

Levon Yolyan was elected chairman of the council of the Youth Union of Armenia.

Armenian-Azerbaijani Border Conflict Viewed

PM2510101390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Oct 90 Union Edition p 3

[Interview with Major General Usik Arutyunyan, chairman of the Armenian KGB, by S. Bablumyan in Yerevan; date not given; under the heading "Border Conflict Update"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] The situation on the border between Armenia and Azerbaijan remains complex. Echoes of the exchanges of fire and armed conflicts which flare up there reach Yerevan and other cities and rayons and immediately add to the tension in the region. Major General Usik Arutyunyan, chairman of the Armenian KGB, talked about how the current situation is viewed.

[Arutyunyan] Any conflict situation that arises on either side of the border acts as a powerful detonator for an explosion or at least another twist in the spiral of rising tension. The latest example I can give you is the arrest of two Armenian people's deputies in Stepanakert. Actions like these, of course, only serve to aggravate an already volatile situation. Exactly the same is achieved by the press' carrying unobjective information on the events here. Or, on the other hand, not carrying any information at all.

[Bablumyan] Criticism of the mass media is becoming commonplace. Journalists are often cursed equally by both sides. Perhaps it has something to do with the information sources we use to bring various statistics to public attention? I assume that your department exchanges information with the Azerbaijan KGB on conflicts which occur along the border. If that is indeed the case, I would like to quote the information you have received from Baku in order to avoid more accusations of lacking objectivity.

[Arutyunyan] I can give you that information, but first I would like to say that various provocative attacks take place on both sides. These actions cannot be justified under any circumstances. But there is also another aspect to all this: Reports of unilateral attacks by "Armenian terrorists" only fuel interethnic discord and deepen the enmity between these two peoples. I am not in favor of counting up the number of attacks and casualties, but I will give you some figures nevertheless.

According to data provided by Azerbaijani law enforcement bodies, 19 people in Armenia have been killed and 46 injured since August last year as a result of shooting by the neighboring side. The figures for Azerbaijan are seven and 27 respectively. Furthermore, nine hostages have been taken in Azerbaijan and 16 in Armenia. Three cases of livestock rustling from Azerbaijan have been registered (880 head) and 13 (6,600 head) of rustling from Armenia to Azerbaijan; only 900 head have been returned.

There is another reason why I have gone against my principles and cited these statistical data, which cast shame on both republics. For some reason, many people regard the Presidential Decree on Disarming Illegal Paramilitary Formations as an essential measure directed exclusively against armed groups in Armenia. But let me put this question to you: Which forces are responsible for all the attacks from the neighboring republic?

[Bablumyan] What can you say about the implementation of the Presidential Decree on Disarming Illegal Paramilitary Formations in Armenia?

[Arutyunyan] You should bear in mind that I would prefer not to consider the disarmament process solely within the context of this well-known decree. That would essentially cancel out a great deal of the work done by law enforcement bodies in this direction since January 1990. More than 2,500 weapons, or 40 percent of the total amount stolen, were confiscated or surrendered during this period. Moreover, all infantry fighting vehicles, armored personnel carriers, and prime mover vehicles were returned. This work has continued since the decree was issued: 53 submachineguns, 360 grenades, 33 mortars and grenade launchers, 17 guns and 235 shells, and a large quantity of ammunition have been confiscated. This work will be continued.

[Bablumyan] What do you feel are the solutions to this very complex situation? Could the confrontation not go on forever?

[Arutyunyan] First of all, both sides must make the greatest possible effort to prevent any negative incidents on the border between the two republics. That is the only way to make the Armenian and Azerbaijani peoples believe in the need for disarmament. In the present atmosphere, it is extremely hard for the Armenian leadership to shape the kind of public opinion that would favor and justify disarmament measures.

I believe that frank, honest dialogue—not only between the leaders of the two republics but also between leaders at rayon level—is the main way to solve this complex problem. It is now more important than ever before to organize close cooperation between law enforcement bodies at local level and to employ frank, direct negotiation to resolve any conflicts that arise, rather than try to find scapegoats "on the other side of the fence."